Rev H. Cotterill

Vigilius Dormitans.

ROMES SEER OVERSEENE.

OR

A TREATISE OF THE FIFT Generall Councell held at Constantinople,

Anno 553. under *Iustinian* the Emperour, in the time of Pope VIGILIVS:

The Occasion being those *Tria Capitula*, which for many yeares troubled the whole Church.

WHEREIN IS PROVED THAT THE POPES Apostolicall Constitution and definitive sentence in matter of Faith, was condemned as hereticall by the Synod.

And the exceeding frauds of Cardinall *Baronius* and *Binius* are clearely discovered.

BY

RICH: CRAKANTHORP Dr. in DIVINITIE;
And Chapleine in ordinary to his late Majestie
KING *IAMES*.

Opus Posthumum.

PVBLISHED AND SET FORTH
BY
His Brother GEO: CRAKANTHORP,
According to a perfect Copy found written under the Authors owne hand.

LONDON,
Printed by *M. F.* for ROBERT MYLBOVRNE in *Pauls* Churchyard at the signe of the Grey-hound. M DC XXXI.

TO

THE RIGHT HONOVRABLE

EDVVARD LORD NEWBVRGE

Chancellour of the Duchie of *Lancaſter*,
and one of the Lords of his Majeſties moſt
Honourable Privie Counſell.

RIGHT HONOVRABLE,



IN all duty and ſubmiſſion I here preſent unto your Lordſhip a Treatiſe concerning the fift generall Councell *held at Conſtantinople, the cauſe being the Controverſie of the Three Chapters which for many yeares troubled the whole Church, and was at length decided in this* Councell *held under* Iuſtinian *that religious Emperour. This Treatiſe, now printed, was long agoe penned by one well known unto your Honour; your ſincere affection to the truth of God and Gods cauſe, gives mee good aſſurance of your favourable acceptance hereof. I confeſſe indeed, that when I call to minde the manifold affaires wherein your Honour is daily imployed, the very thought hereof had almoſt perſwaded mee not to interrupt your more ſerious affaires, by drawing your Honour to the reading or view of this*

Booke: but when I call to minde those respects of love and duty, in which the Author hereof stood bound unto your Lordship, I was againe incouraged in his name to tender it to your Honour: And although I my selfe can challenge no interest in your Lordships favour to offer this, yet your Lordship may challenge some interest in the fruits of his labours, who was so truely (as I can truely speake) devoted unto your Honour. Among many other, hee especially acknowledged two assured bonds of love and duty by which hee was obliged unto you, and your friends; the former arose from that unfained affection which you ever bare him from your first acquaintance in the Colledge; that other, by which he was further ingaged unto you, and your friends, was, when in a loving respect had unto him in his absence, without any meanes made by him, or knowledge of his, he was called by that much honoured Knight Sir Iohn Levison *his Patron, your Father in law, unto the best* [a] *meanes of livelihood he ever enjoyed in the Ministery, where spending himselfe in his studies, hee ended his dayes; during which time your Honour made your affection further knowne unto him by speciall expressions of extraordinary favours: In regard whereof I perswaded my selfe, that I could no where better crave Patronage for this worke, than of your Honour, that it may bee a further testimony of his love againe, who cannot now speake for himselfe. And this I intreat leave to doe, the rather, because I doubt not but hee acquainted your Lordship with his paines and intent in this, and other Tractates of the Councels; [b] for when after divers yeares study bestowed*

a Black Notley in *Essex.*

b See his Epistle to the Reader for the defence of *Iustinian*, printed *Anno* 1616.

"*ſhowed in this argument of* Councels, *hee was deſi-*
"*rous to make ſome uſe of his labours; his intent was,*
"*to reduce all thoſe points into foure ſeverall Bookes;*
"1. *That the* right *of calling generall* Councels;
"2. *That the* right *of higheſt* Preſidency *in them;*
"3. *That the* right *of the laſt and ſupreme* Confir-
"mation *of them; is onely* Imperiall *and not* Papall.
"4. *That all the lawfull generall* Councels *which*
"*hitherto have beene held, conſent with ours, and op-*
"*pugne the doctrines of the preſent* Church of
"Rome. *Some of theſe hee finiſhed, the fourth hee*
"*could not ſo much as hope to accompliſh, and there-*
"*fore after the examining of ſome particulars there-*
"*in, he deſiſted and weaned himſelfe from thoſe ſtu-*
"*dies: And yet after ſome yeares diſcontinuance,*
"*being by ſome of his learned friends ſollicited to*
"*communicate to others, at leaſt ſome one Tract in that*
"*argument, conſenting to their earneſt deſire, after*
"*long ſuſpence he reſolved on this Treatiſe, as being*
"*for weighty and important matters moſt delightfull*
"*unto him. That it was not then publiſhed, let it not*
"*ſeeme ſtrange unto your Honour, for having long*
"*ſince finiſhed the Tract of this whole* Councell, *it*
"*was his purpoſe, that it ſhould have undergone the*
"*publike view and judgement of the Church; but when*
"*he came (as I can truely teſtifie) unto them, whoſe*
"*art and ayde is needfull in ſuch a buſineſſe, and found*
"*an averſeneſſe in them, for that it wholy conſiſted of*
"*controverſall matters, whereof they feared that this*
"*age had taken a ſatiety, he reſted in this anſwer, as*
willing to bury it. After this, being upon a ſpetiall

command

command from his Majesty, King Iames *of blessed memory, made known unto him by my* Lord his Grace of Canterbury, *to addresse himselfe to* [c] *another worke, hee then desisted from his former intended purpose, and in finishing of that last worke of his, he ended his dayes. Some few yeares after his death being desirous to take a view of some of his Papers, I came to the view and handling of this boooke, a booke fully perfected for the Presse in his life time, the publishing whereof being long expected, and of many earnestly desired, it was my desire and theirs, to whose most grave and judicious censure I willingly submitted it, that it might be published for the benefit of Gods Church, and the rather, that it might give some light in the study of the Councels, and animate some of* the [d] threescore valiant men that are about *Salomons* bed, being of the expert and valiant men of Israel, *unto the attempting and undertaking of the like: Now what his desire was in this, and other of his labours, surely none but the very enemies of God and Gods truth, can take it to be any other than to testifie his unfained love unto God and Gods Church, and to subdue the pride, idolatries and impieties of that* Man of sinne, *and to* [e] *strive for the* maintenance of the true faith. *Now what allowance so ever it may finde abroad among our* adversaries, *it humbly craves your favourable acceptãce at home; and as it is published with no other intent than to gaine glory to God, and good to his Church, so I doubt not but that God, who* [f] causeth light to shine out of darknesse, *will effectually in time bring to passe, that not onely their violent oppugning*

[c] *Defensio Ecclesiæ Anglic. cont. Archiep. Spal.*

[d] *Eccles 3.7.*

[e] *Iude Epist. v. 3*

[f] *2 Cor. 4.6.*

ning of the truth, but their fraudulent dealing also against the same, wil, if not breed in themselves, yet increase in al welwillers unto the truth, a constant dislike, nay, detestation of their hereticall and Antichristian doctrines, and for your selfe my earnest and continuall prayer to God shall bee, that you may ever continue your religious and ardent desire to advance Gods truth and honour here, which will procure your owne immortall fame in this world, and, through Gods mercy in Christ, eternall felicity in that life, which, being unlike to this, shall neither have end of dayes, nor end of blessednesse.

Barton neare Bury S. Edmonds in Suffolke, April 29. 1631.

Your Lordships

humbly devoted

GEO: CRAKANTHORP.



AN ADVERTISEMENT TO THE CHRISTIAN READER touching the Scope, Argument and manifold Vse of this ensuing Treatise.

IT is not ambition to live in other mens writings, but desire, if I could, to breath some life into them, which hath drawn me of late rather to preface other mens works, than to perfit mine owne. It grieved me much to see such evidences lie in the darke, which being produced to publike view, would give singular light to the truth: And if *Socrates*, the mirrour of modesty in a Philosopher, held it no disparagement to professe, that he performed the office of a *Midwife* to other mens *wits*, by helping them in the *deliverie* of those conceptions wherein himselfe had no part: why should I either feare or regard any detraction from the living, for a charitable office in this kinde to the dead? doubtlesse if the office of a *Midwife* be at any time needfull, it is then most necessarie, when the living Child is to be take out of the dead wombe of the parent: Such was this *Posthumus*, in whom I hope the observation of [a] *Plinie* concerning children thus borne will bee verified: *For the most part* (saith hee) *those Children prove most lively and fortunate, of whom the Parents dye in travell*; never seeing them live, who cost them their lives. The instances are many & very illustrious, *Fabius* [b] *Cæso* thrice Consul, *Scipio* surnamed the Africane, *Iulius Cæsar* the first & most renowned of all the Romane Emperours, and our peerlesse K. *Edward* 6. Howbeit I confesse, it is an hard thing to *calculate the nativity* of a Book, and certainly foretell what hazzard the

a *Plin. Nat. Hist. l. 7. c. 9. Auspicatius enecta Parente nascuntur, sicut Scipio Africanus primusque Cæsarum à Cæso matris utero dictus: simili modo natus et Manlius qui Carthaginem cum exercitu intravit.*

b *Tert. lib. de resur. carnis. Possumus illos recogitare qui exesso matris utero vivi aerem hauserunt, Laberij aliqui et Scipiones et Fabius Cæso ter Consul.*

 impression

impreſſion of a Treatiſe of this ſubject may runne or gueſſe what argument will pleaſe the *divers taſts* of this *diſtempered* age; yet this I am confident of, that all who exactly view this worke in all parts, and compare it with others, drawne with *the ſame Penſill*, will eſteeme it like the [c] *Minerva* of *Phidias his Maſterpeece*: It coſt him neare as many yeares labour as *Iſocrates Panegyrique*, the Prime roſe of his flowry Garden, did him. This Author perfected this worke in his life time, and commanded it, after a ſort, to the Preſſe in the laſt [d] booke hee publiſhed by command from ſupreme authority in defence of the Church of *England* againſt the calumnies of the revolted Archbiſhop of *Spalata*, (in theſe words:) *The Church "had beene undone if Vigilius his decree had taken place; But the "moſt holy Emperour Iuſtinian, and the fift Councell then happily "ſhewed themſelves Pillars of the Catholike faith; concerning which "whole Councell I deſire you to take notice of an intire booke written "by mee, wherein the innumerable frauds, lies and hereſies of* Baro- "nius *are manifeſtly detected; out of that booke, if it ſee light and "come to your hands, you ſhall underſtand and plainly perceive how "fraile and reedy your Romane Pillar is.*

In which paſſage he inſinuates, that the argument of it is, *non de ſtillicidiis, aut aquis pluviis*, not of *Eves droppings* or water paſſages, but of the *Roofe* of the houſe and *Arch* it ſelfe, the authority of *Councels*, and the infallibilitie of the Papall *Chaire*. The *Title* carried through the whole booke, carrieth not the greateſt part of it, *plus [e] in receſſu eſt, quam à fronte promittit*; his warehouſe within is fraught with more variety of rich ſtuffs thã is ſet out on his ſhop. An entire Treatiſe of the *fift generall Councell*, hee profeſſedly undertaketh; but *currente rota*, in the proſecution of this argument, hee taketh tardy *Baronius*, and *Binius*, and other Romiſh *falſaries*; hee runneth through all the later generall Councels; he ſubſtantially handleth the maine Controverſies concerning the power of calling, and authority ratifying Eccleſiaſticall Synods, and ſo cleareth all Antiquity on the Reformed ſide in points of great moment, that I perſwade my ſelfe, the wiſer ſort of our learned adverſaries, who will by ſtealth get a ſight thereof, will take good counſell, and utterly derelinquiſh their moſt glorious, but moſt vaine and falſe claime to *generall Councels*; for

[c] *Cic. Orator.*

[d] *Def. Eccleſ. Angl. cap. 4. p. 19 De quo toto Concilio conſcriptum ſcias à me librum integrum, in quo innumerabiles Baronij fraudes, mendacia, etiam et hæreſes palam detecta, &c.*

[e] *Quintil. inſtit. Orat. lib. 1. ca. 4.*

for if wee devide the Councels, that beare the ſtile of *Oecumenicall* and *Generall*, according to the different times in which they were held; into *pure*, *mixt*, and *wholly corrupt*; the firſt of undoubted, the ſecond of doubtful, the third undoubtedly of no authority at all; the firſt are wholly ours; the laſt are wholly theirs, in the middle ſort we part ſtakes w^th^ them: 4. of the firſt ranke have beene heretofore wreſted perforce out of the Romaniſts hands by Biſhop *Iewell*, Biſh. *Bilſon*, D^r^ *Reinolds*, D^r^ *Whitaker* and others. The fift, this accompliſht Antiquary vindicates alſo from them, and declareth how in the Councels of the ſecond ranke we ſhare with them; and in fine hee leaveth them nothing intirely, but the *lees* and *dregs* of all *Councels*, the *Laterane* and *Trent*. *Habeant quod ſunt*, let them have theſe *lees* to themſelves, who themſelves, *Moab*-like, for theſe many ages are *ſetled upon the lees* of their owne corruption.

Had this judicious and induſtrious Writer bent all his forces againſt the Romaniſts falſe pretended *right* to generall *Councels*, and forcibly beat them out of that Hold onely, hee had deſerved that Eulogiũ which the [f] *Iewes* give any *Rabbin*, to whom they are indebted for any wiſe ſaying or apt note upon any Scripture text, [g] ZICRONO LIBRACHA, *ſit memoria ejus in benedictione*, *bleſſed be his memorie*: how much more when he aſſaulteth the maine *fort* of the *Romiſh faith*, and by impregnable authorities and infallible reaſons overthroweth the *Popes* ſuppoſed *infallibility*, when hee *ſits in his Chaire*, and with his *Romane Synod*, determineth out of it queſtions, and defineth Articles of faith. This is indeed to *let* Rome *bleed* in her *Maſter-veine*, to *ſtrike* hereſie at the *roote*, to *cruſh* the *Cockatrice* in the *head*, not to batter and breake downe the mudd-wals, but utterly to ruinate the very foundation of the *Tower of Babell*. For howſoever Scriptures, Fathers, Councels, and the Catholike Church, κομψῶς μὲν εἰρῆσθαι are pompouſly brought in into their Polemike writings againſt us; yet the laſt reſolution of their faith is upon the Pope, who gives credit to Fathers, validity to Councels, and authority, at leaſt *quoad nos*, to the Scriptures themſelves. This their Champion *Bellarmine* ἐκ ἀρχῆς ἐπὶ σφαλῶν ἐχόμενα εἶναι, and *Skulkenius* his ſecond confidently undertakes to maintaine againſt all oppug-

[f] *Paulus Fagius Epiſt. ad Albertum, eſt magna religio apud Judæos non ſubjicere nouem eius qui boni aliquid dixit, docuit aut ſcripſit.*

[g] *Vid. comment. Rabb. paſſim.*

ners of the Popes tranſcendent power, and uncontroulable *verdict* in matters *of eternall life and death.* The [h] Cardinall thus flouriſheth, *In our diſputations about the word of "God we have already ſhewed, that the Scripture is not the Iudge of "Controverſies, nor are ſecular Princes, nor private perſons, "though learned and honeſt, but Eccleſiaſticall Prelates; in our diſ-"putations of the Councels it ſhall bee demonſtrated, that Councels "generall and particular may judge of Controverſies in religion, but "that judgement of theirs is then of force and validity when the "Pope ſhall confirme it, and therfore that the laſt judgement of all is "the Popes,* to which all good Catholikes owe ſuch abſolute "obedience, *that [i] if the Pope ſhould erre by commanding vices "and prohibiting vertues, the Church is bound to beleeve, that vices "are good, and vertues bad, unleſſe ſhe wil ſinne againſt Conſcience.* What, ſinne againſt Conſcience in not ſinning, and not ſinne againſt Conſcience in committing ſinnes knowne by the light of nature, if the *Man of ſin* command the one and forbid the other? *Woe bee to them,* ſaith the Prophet, *that call evill good, and good evill, put darkneſſe for light, and light for darkneſſe, bitter for ſweet, and ſweet for bitter,* Eſay. 5. 20. If *Bellarmines* divinity be currant, Pope *Pius* the fourth needed not to have coyned twelve new Articles [k] of faith, affixt to the Canons of the Councell of *Trent*: it had beene ſufficient to have added this one, *I beleeve in the Pope his ſoveraigne infallibility,* for this is *prora* and *puppis*, the *Alpha* and *Omega*, the *formalis ratio* and *demonſtratio* [l] of a Papiſts beliefe. *The Popes power* (ſaith *Skulkenius* [l]) *is the hinge and foundation, and,* to ſpeake in a word, *the ſumme of Chriſtian faith*: A ſhort ſumme and ſoone caſt up. What then ſerves *Fathers, Councels, Church-Traditions,* and *Scripture it ſelfe* for with them? for little better than Ciphers, which being added to the Popes authority in their Arithmetike makes ſomething, but without it nothing. To begin with Scriptures, they beleeve them to bee divine, but not becauſe the Scripture ſaith, *that all Scripture* [m] *is given by divine inſpiration*: *For ſo* (ſaith [n] *Bellarmine*) *wee read every where in the Alcoran of Mahomet, that the Alcoran was ſent from God, yet we beleeve it not*; why then doe they beleeve them to bee the word of God? hee anſwers readily, *propter traditionem Eccleſiæ, for the Churches tradition.* [o] *Silveſter Pierius* outvies the Cardinall,

h *Bell. de Rom. Pontif. lib. 4. ca. 1 in diſputatione de verbo Dei. Iam oſtendimus iudicem controverſiarum non eſſe ſcripturam, nec ſeculares Principes, &c. ac proinde ultimum iudicium ſummi Pontificis eſſe.*

i *Bell. de Rom. Pontif. lib. 4. ca. 5 in fine. Si Papa erraret præcipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Eccleſia credere vitia eſſe bona, et virtutes malas, niſi vellet contra conſcientiam peccare.*

k *Bulla Pij 4. ſuper forma juramenti profeſſionis fidei, anno Dom. 1564.*

l *Skulkē. Apolog. pro Bell. ca. 6. Pontificia poteſtas eſt velut cardo, fundamētū, et ut uno verbo dicam, ſumma fidei Chriſtianæ.*

m *2 Tim. 3. 16.*

n *Bell. de verbo Dei non ſcripto lib. 4. ca. 4. Etiamſi ſcriptura dicat libros Prophetarum, et Apoſtolorum eſſe divinos, tamen non certo id credam, niſi prius credidero, ſcripturam quæ hoc dicit eſſe divinam, nam etiam in Alcorano Mahometi paſſim legimus ipſum Alcoranum de Cælo à Deo miſſū, &c.*

o *Quicunq; non inuititur doctrinæ Romanæ Eccleſiæ, ac Romani Pontificis tanquā regulæ fidei infallibili, à quā etiam ſacra Scriptura robur trahit et authoritatē, hereticus eſt: cōtra Lutherū.*

nall,

nall, affirming, *that the holy Scripture taketh force and authority from the Romane Church and Pope.* Vpon which premiſe of *Pierius*, *Gretzer* [p] inferres this peremptory concluſion, *We doe receive and reverence that alone for the word of God which the Pope in Peters Chaire doth determine to be ſo.* Strange divinity to beleeve, that the Scriptures receive their authority from the Church, that is, that God receives his authority from man. May we not juſtly upbraid the preſent Romaniſts, as *Tertullian* [q] doth the ancient heathen, *apud vos de humano arbitratu divinitas penſitatur, niſi homini Deus placuerit, Deus non erit; Homo jam Deo propitius eſſe debebit; With you Deity is eſtimated by mans valuation, unleſſe God pleaſe man, he ſhall not be God, now man muſt bee propitious to God*; for if the Pope be not propitious to the Scripture to allow it for Gods word, it ſhall not paſſe for ſuch in Rome.

As for the Fathers; they deale with their writings as *Fauſtus Manicheus* did with the writings of the Apoſtles, *in* [r] *which hee takes it for a good proofe, that ſuch paſſages are the Apoſtles true writings, becauſe they made for him*; others *were ſpurious, becauſe they made againſt him: Fathers*, ſaith [s] *Dureus, are not to bee accounted Fathers, when they teach or write any thing of their owne, which they have not received from the Church*, meaning the Romane; and *Gretzer* [t] backs this aſſertion with a reaſon drawn from the formall definition of a Father: *for*, ſaith he, *he is a father of the Church, who feeds and nouriſheth the Church with wholeſome doctrine, who being ſet over the Lords houſhold, gives them their meaſure of Corne in due ſeaſon; now if in ſtead of wholeſome food and good Corne hee give them Cockle and Tares, he becomes no father but a ſtepfather, no Doctor but a ſeducer.*

To inſtance in ſome particular; *Euſebius Cæſarienſis* when hee ſeemes to favour Popery, hee is highly extolled by *Lindane* [u], *Senenſis* [x], and *Poſſevine* [y], hee is then *a moſt famous writer of the Church, moſt learned, worthy to bee Biſhop, not of one City onely, but of the whole world*; but when the ſame *Euſebius* lookes awry upon Rome, then hee is branded by *Canus* [z], *Coſterus* [a], and *Baronius* [b], *for a ſtickler for Arrius, an Arrian heretike, a ringleader of the Arrian faction, whoſe memory is accurſed in the ſecond Synod of Nice. Tertullian* likewiſe is guilded by *Lindanus* [c] and *Rebing* [d], with the glorious titles of *a very noble*

Author,

p Gretz. defenſ. Bell. lib. 1. de verbo Dei. Id ſolum, ro verbo Dei venemur ac ſuſcipimus, quod nobis Pontifices ex Cathedra Petri tradũt.

q Tertul. Apol. adverſus gentes Ca. 5.

r Auguſt. lib. 11. contra Fauſtum Manicheum, ca. 2. inde probo inquiebat Fauſtus, hoc illius eſſe, illud non eſſe, quia hoc pro me ſonat, illud contra me.

s Dureus adverſus Whitakerum, fol. 140. Neq; enim patres cenſentur, cum ſuum aliquid quod ab eccleſia non acceperunt, vel ſcribunt vel dicunt.

t Gretz. lib. 2. de iure & more prohibendi libros noxios. ca. 10. Nam Eccleſiæ pater ille dicitur, qui Eccleſiam ſalutari doctrinæ pabulo alit et paſcit, iam ergo ſi pro ſalutari doctrinæ pabulo admetiatur Lolium et Zizania non Pater eſt ſed Vitricus.

u Lindan. Panoplia lib. 1. ca. 17.

x Senenſis Bib. S. titulo Euſebius.

y Poſſevinus in apparatu ſacro.

z Canus locorum Theol. lib. 7. ca. 3

a Coſter. in Apolog. contra Greuinc. ca. 8.

b Baron. ad annum 340.

c Lind. panoplia lib. 1. cap. 23.

d Rebing. in muris Civitatis ſanctæ fund. 2. et 12.

author, the chiefe of all the Latine Fathers, the great light of Africa, a moſt ancient Writer and Doctour, moſt learned, moſt skilfull, moſt acute; where hee hath ſome paſſages which may bee detorted to give countenance to ſome Romiſh ſuperſtitions: But elſewhere when in expreſſe words he oppugneth ſome doctrines defined now for Articles of faith in the Church of Rome, he is as much beſmeared with foule imputations by *Azorius* [e], *Maldonate* [f], and *Bellarmine* [g], *An hereticall author, an Arch-heretike, an enemy to the Catholike, and like to the Calviniſts, a mã whoſe authority is not much to be ſet by, becauſe he was no man of the Church*: and as *Euſeb.* & *Tertull.* ſo alſo *Origen* hath had contrary *teſtimonials* from the Church of *Rome*, where he pleaſeth them hee is [h] *a famous light of the Church of Alexandria, whom* S. Hier. *cals another M*r *of the Churches after the Apoſtles, a* [i] *Witneſſe beyond all exception*; But when he fits not their humours, then *he is a Schiſmatike* [k], *a father of the Arrians and Eunomians, a bold* [l] *and raſh man, an obſtinate lover of his owne errours.*

In *Councels* the caſe is yet clearer, for the Cardinall ſticks not in moſt plaine termes to hang all them upon the *Popes ſleeve*: *The* [m] *whole ſtrength & authority* (ſaith he) *of lawfull Councels is from the Pope, their* [n] *judgment then begins to be of force after the Pope ſhall ratifie them.* And what Councels will he ratifie? you may bee ſure not the Councell in *Trulio*, for that taxeth the Romane Church by name for inforcing ſingle life upon the Clergy: not the Councell at [o] Conſtantinople, under *Conſtantine Pogonate*, for that accurſeth *Honorius* the Pope for an heretike: not the Councell held at *Frankfort* [p] in the time of Pope *Adrian*, for that condemneth their Image-worſhip: not the Synod of *Piſa* [q], for in that *Gregory* and *Benedict* Popes, were depoſed: not the Synod [r] of *Baſil*, wherein *Eugenius* was unpoped; nor the Councell of Conſtance [s], for in it a generall Councel is ſet above the Pope, and three Popes were caſhiered by their Authority, (I except the later Seſſions of the ſame condemned Councell, which are Goſpell with them, becauſe they Anathematize the Wicliffiſts and Huſſites:) But the [t] ſecond Synod of *Nice* ſhall be held for a generall Councell, becauſe it defendeth and commandeth the worſhip of Images; though it be full of blaſphemous abſurdities and was called by an inſolent woman domineering

[e] *Azorius moral. lib. 8. cap. 16.*
[f] *Maldon. in Matth. cap. 16. verſ. 19. p. 340.*
[g] *Bell. de ſanctorum beat. lib. 1. cap. 5. p. 1938. Bell. de Sacram. Euchar. lib. 3. cap. 6. p. 698.*
[h] *Lind. Panopl. lib. 3 c. 24. et 26.*
[i] *Dureus contra Whitac. fol. 109.*
[k] *Canus loc. Theol. l. 7. c. 3. Maldon. in Ioan. cap. 1. verſ. 3. pag. 399.*
[l] *Ribera in Malach. Prophet. proemium.*
[m] *Bell. de Rom. Pont. lib. 4. ca. 3 Tota firmitas legitimorum Conciliorum eſt à Pontifice Romano, et cap. 1.*
[n] *Conciliorum iudicium tum demũ firmum eſt cum acceſſerit Rom. Pontificis confirmatio.*
[o] *An. Do. 681.*
[p] *An. Do. 794.*
[q] *An. Do. 1409.*
[r] *An. Do. 1430.*
[s] *An. Do. 1414.*
[t] *An. 787.*

Irenæ.

over

over her husband, and devoted wholly to superstition. The Councell [u] of Laterane, though consisting of none in a manner, but the Popes creatures, shall, in despight of the Oecumenicall Councels of *Pisa*, *Constance* and *Basil*, bee held a holy and generall Councell, because it defines, that the Pope is above generall Councels; and for greater reason will the Pope advance the small Conventicle of *Trent* to the honour of a sacred Oecumenicall Councell, because it is throughly for them in all points; though, as a learned Bishop, present at that Councell, truely affirmes, *that matters in it came to that passe "through the wickednesse of those hungry* [x] *Bishops, that hung upon "the Popes sleeve, and were created on the sudden by the Pope for "the purpose, that that Councell seemed to bee an assembly, not of Bi- "shops, but of Hobgoblins, not of men, but of Images moved like the "statues of* Dædalus, *by the sinewes of others.*

[u] *An. Do.* 1517.

[x] *Dudithius quinque Eccles. Epist. ad Maximilianum secundum Cæsarem.*

Lastly, for their pretended title of Catholike Church, it may be said of it as it was of *Pompeius* [y] Sirname in his declining age and fame, *Stat magni nominis umbra*, *'tis but the shadow of a great name*; for by it they meane nothing but their particular Church of *Rome*, or the Pope himselfe: Thus *Bellarmine* glosseth upon the words of our Saviour, *Matth.* 16. the Pope, *Peters* successor, is bid to [z] *tell the Church*, that is, *to tell himselfe as Governour, and the Church which hee governs. Gretzer* [a] comes off more roundly; *Thou wilt say, they interpret the Church the Pope: I grant it; what then?* And [b] *Greg. de Valent. By the name of the Church wee understand the Head of the Church, the Pope*: and *Bozius* [c] declares this mysterie more explicitely, *The Pope sustaineth the person of all Bishops, of all Councels, of the whole Church.*

[y] *Lucan de bello civ. l.* 1.

[z] *Bell. de Concil. author. l.* 2. *c.* 19. *Dicere Ecclesiæ, id est, sibi ipsi ut præsidi, et Ecclesiæ, cui ipse præest.*

[a] *Gretz. defen. Bell. lib.* 3. *de verbo Dei; Alii tertiò interpretantur Ecclesiam Papam, non abnuo, quid tum?*

[b] 2. 2. *disput.* 1. *q.* 1.

[c] *Boz. lib.* 2. *de signis Eccl. ca.* 21.

The learned Author then of this ensuing Tractate foyling the Pope, consequently foyleth the whole Romane Church, though he take onely *Vigilius* to taske, yet in overturning his Chaire hee overthroweth, as hath beene shewed, all the Romane religion, which is *fundamentally* in the Popes Decree, and the whole Romane Church, which is *vertually*, as they teach, in his person. For as Pope *Vigilius*, not as a private man, but as Pope *in Cathedra*, not sitting alone, but with his Synod, may erre, not onely in matter of fact, but in matter of faith, judicially and doctrinally determining heresie, and com-

See farther in this Treatise, *cap.* 13. *p.* 174.

commanding it to bee received for Catholike truth: and if this deciſion and determination of his bee reverſed, condemned and accurſed in a lawfully called, ſacred and Oecumenicall Synod, approved by the Chriſtian world, all which are in the following Treatiſe punctually and uncontroulably proved againſt all cavils of moderne Papiſts,

——*Ecquis poſthac Paparum numen adoret?*

Will any man hereafter, not wholly given over to be infatuated with *ſtrong deluſions*, adore the *Popes Chaire?* or *kiſſe his foote?* or pawne his ſalvation upon his *Cathedrall determination?*

By all this diſcourſe thou maiſt ſee, Chriſtian Reader, the maine ſcope of the Author; I ſhall not need to inlarge upon other queſtions of leſſer moment, though now more in *vogue*, which upon the by and occaſionally this learned Writer accutely handleth both in this worke and others, eſpecially in that impoſed upon him by our late Soveraigne of bleſſed memory, in defence of our Church, *Chap.* 35, 36, 37, 38, & 78.

Wherfore ſith the Compoſer of this Treatiſe is moſt orthodoxall, the argument of great importance, the manner of handling very exact and accurate, I doubt not but thou wilt give it ſuch entertainment, as that thereby others may bee incouraged to tread in his ſteps, and to guide thee in the right way. What though the worke be of ſome bulke and waight? who ever found fault with gold for that it was too maſſie and heavy? When *Tully* [d] was asked which Oration of *Demoſthenes* he liked beſt, hee anſwered, the longeſt; and queſtionleſſe in bookes of this nature, *cæteris paribus*, the largeſt which meete with all poſſible, or at leaſt probable objections, and ſolidly refutes them, give the beſt ſatisfaction. Is it not a ſhame to ſee in many mens ſtudies idle Poems, *Aſtreas*, *Guzmans*, and play-books in folio, but divinity books in *decimo ſexto*, or ſlender păphlets, ſtitcht up in blew coats, without any cognizăce, glancing at Church or State, or trĕching upon Controverſies better buried alive, than to bee revived after they are dead; which are cryed up by the common adverſary, of purpoſe to foment diſcords betweene the profeſſors of the Goſpell, that whilſt, *Paſtores odia exercent, Lupus intret Ovile;*

[d] *Plut. in vit. Cicer.*

le, the ſhepheards are at ſtrife, the Wolfe may make havocke of the flocke. which I ſpeake not for a *juſtitium* to any errour, or that I wiſh any way ſhould bee given to thoſe plauſible tenents to corrupt reaſon, which one of late fitly compared to *flat bottom'd Boates ſent from our neighbouring Countries to land Popery in England.* But firſt my deſire is, that all that agree in the love of the ſame truth, may ſeeke that truth in love, and continually [e] *pray for the peace of Ieruſalem*; next I pray, that [f] *our love may abound yet more and more in knowledge, and in all judgment, that wee may diſcerne things that differ*, and ſo ſeeke by all good and lawfull meanes to deſtroy the *wrigling tayle of the Adder*, whoſe head was ſmitten off 1200. yeares agoe in a Synod at *Paleſtine*, that yet our principall care bee to drive out the *Romiſh Baſiliske*, or rather *the* [g] *King of the Locuſts*, againſt whoſe poyſon I commend the enſuing Diſcourſe as a ſoveraigne antidote.

e *Pſal.* 122.
f *Phil.* 1. 9.
g *Apoc.* 9. 11.

Lambeth, April 26.
Anno Dom. 1631.

Thine in the Lord Ieſus

DANIEL FEATLEY.

THE CONTENTS OF THE SEVERALL CHAPTERS CONTAINED IN THIS ENSVING TREATISE.

Cap.

1. 
HAt Iuſtinian *aſſembled the fift generall Councell at Conſtantinople, to define the doubt of faith which aroſe about the* Three Chapters. Pag. 1.

2. *That the fift Generall Councell, when Pope* Vigilius *wilfully refuſed to come unto it, was held without the Popes preſence therin, either by himſelfe, or by his Legates.* pag. 4.

3. *That Pope* Vigilius, *during the time of the fift Councell, publiſhed his* Apoſtolicall Conſtitution *in defence of the* Three Chapters. p. 7.

4. *That the holy Generall Councell in their Synodall judgement contradicted the Popes* Apoſtolicall Conſtitution, *and definitive ſentence in that cauſe of faith made knowne before unto them.* 14.

5. *The firſt Exception of* Baronius, *pretending that the cauſe of the* Three Chapters *was no cauſe of faith, refuted.* 36.

6. *That the firſt reaſon of* Vigil. *touching the* Firſt Chapter, *why* Theodorus *of Mopſveſtia ought not to be condemned,* Becauſe none after their death ought *Noviter* to bee condemned, *concernes the faith, and is hereticall.* 47.

7. *That the ſecond reaſon of* Vigilius *touching the* Firſt Chapter, *why* Theodorus *of Mopſveſtia ought not to bee condemned,* becauſe hee dyed in the peace and Communion of the Church, *is erronious and untrue.* 58.

8. *That the third and laſt reaſon of* Vigilius, *touching the* Firſt Chapter, *why* Theodorus *of Mopſveſtia ought not to bee condemned,* becauſe he was not condemned by former Fathers and Councels, *is erronious and untrue.* 67.

Cap.

9. *That* Vigilius, *beſides divers perſonall, held a doctrinall errour in faith, in his defence of the* Second Chapter, *which concernes the writings of* Theodorus *againſt* Cyril. Pag. 91.

10. *That* Vigilius *and* Baronius *erre in divers perſonall points, or matters of fact concerning the* Third Chapter, *which was the* Epiſtle of *Ibas* unto *Maris*. 107.

11. *That* Vigilius *and* Baronius *in their former reaſon for defence of the* Epiſtle of *Ibas*, *drawne from* the union with *Cyrill*, mentioned in the later part of that Epiſtle, *doe defend all the hereſies of the Neſtorians*. 112.

12. *That* Vigilius *and* Baronius *in their later reaſon for defence of the* Epiſtle of *Ibas*, *taken from the words of* Ibas, *wherein he confeſſeth* Two natures and One Perſon to be in Chriſt, *doe maintaine all the hereſies of the Neſtorians*. 138.

13. *Two aſſertions of* Baronius *about the defenders of the* Three Chapters, *refuted; and two other againſt them confirmed; the one*, That to diſſent from the Pope in a cauſe of faith makes one neither an heretike nor a Schiſmatike: *the other*, That to aſſent in faith to the Pope or preſent Church of Rome, makes one both an Heretike and a Schiſmatike. 170.

14. *The ſecond Exception of* Baronius *excuſing* Vigilius *from hereſie*, For that hee often profeſſeth to hold the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and the faith thereof, *refuted*. 199.

15. *The third Exception of* Baronius *in excuſe of* Vigilius, *taken from* his confirming of the fift Councell, *anſwered*: *and how Pope* Vigilius *three or foure times changed his judgment in this cauſe of faith*. 213.

16. *That the* Decree *Pope of* Vigil. *for* Taciturnity, touching the Three Chapters, *and the Councell wherein it is ſuppoſed to bee made, and all the* Conſequents upon that Decree, *painted out by* Baronius, *are all fictions and Poeticall*. 225.

17. *That* Vigilius *neither by his Pontificall* Decree, *nor ſo much as by a* perſonall profeſſion, *conſented to, or confirmed the fift Councell, after the end thereof, or after his ſuppoſed exile*. 240.

18. *The fourth and laſt Exception of* Baronius *in defence of* Vigilius, *pretending*, That the fift Councell, wherein the Decree of *Vigilius* was condemned, was neither a generall nor a lawfull Councell, till *Vigilius* confirmed the ſame, *refuted*. 266.

Cap.

Cap.

19. *The true notes to know which are* Generall *and* lawfull, *which either are not* Generall, *or being* Generall, *are no* lawfull Councels, *with divers examples of both kindes; and that none of those which the Romanists doe reckon after the sixt, are* Generall lawfull Councels. Pag. 291.

20. *How Cardinall* Baronius *revileth the Emperour* Iustinian, *and a refutation of the same.* 324.

21. *How* Baronius *revileth* Theodora the Empresse, *and a refutation of the same.* 355.

22. *How* Baronius *declameth against* the Cause it selfe of the Three Chapter, *and a refutation of the same.* 361.

23. *How* Baronius *revileth both* the Imperiall Edict of *Iustinian*, and *Theodorus* Bishop of *Cesarea*, *and a refutation of the same.* 363.

24. *How* Baronius *carpeth at the* Synodall Acts of the fift Councell, as corrupted, *and a refutation in generall of the same.* 377.

25. *The* 1. Alteration *of the Synodall Acts pretended by* Baronius, For that the Text of the Councell at *Chalcedon* is changed therein, *refuted.* 381.

26. *The* 2. Alteration *of the Synodall Acts pretended by* Baronius, For that *Ibas* is said therein to have denyed the Epistle written to *Maris* to be his, *refuted.* 386.

27. *The* 3. Alteration *of the Synodall Acts pretended by* Baronius, For that the Councell of *Chalcedon* is said therein to condemne the Epistle of *Ibas*, *refuted.* 389.

28. *The Three first* Defects *in the Synodall Acts pretended by* Baronius, For that the Acts against the Origenists, The Edict of *Iustinian*, And his Epistle touching that cause, are wanting therein, *refuted.* 391.

29. *The* 4. Defect *in the Synodall Acts pretended by* Baronius, For that the Emperours Epistle to the fift Councell is wanting therein, *refuted.* 398.

30. *The* 5. Defect *in the Synodall Acts pretended by* Baronius, For that the Constitution of Pope *Vigilius*, concerning the Three Chapters is wanting therein, *refuted*, 399.

31. *The* 6. Defect *in the Synodall Acts pretended by* Baronius, For that the Decree which advanced *Ierusalem* to a Patriarchall dignity is wanting therein, *refuted.* 403.

Cap.

32. *The two first* Additions *to the Synodall Acts pretended by* Baronius, For that the Epistle of *Mennas* to *Vigilius*, And the two lawes of *Theodosius*, are falsly inserted therein, *refuted*. 408.

33. *The* 3. Addition *to the Synodall Acts pretended by* Baronius, For that the Epistle of *Theodoret* written to *Nestorius* after the Vnion, is falsly inserted therein, *refuted*. 413.

34. *The* 4. Addition *to the Synodall Acts pretended by* Baronius, For that the Epistle of *Theodoret* to *Iohn* Bishop of *Antioch*, is falsly inserted therein, *refuted*. 422.

35. *That* Baronius *himselfe followeth many* forged writings *in handling this cause of the fift Councell, as particularly* the Excommunication ascribed to *Vigilius, and the* Confession ascribed to *Mennas, Theodorus*, and others. 44c.

36. *That* Baronius *reproveth Pope* Vigilius for his comming to Constantinople, *and a refutation thereof: with a* Description of the life of the same *Vigilius*. 462.

A TREATISE OF THE FIFT GENERALL COVNCILL held at *Conſtantinople* under *Fuſtinian*, in the time of Pope *Vigilius*: Wherein the exceeding fraud and falſhoods of Cardinall *Baronius* are clearely diſcovered.

CAP. I.

That the Emperour IVSTINIAN *aſſembled the Fift Generall Councill, to define a doubt of Faith, about* The three Chapters.

CONCILIA *generalia mea ſunt; primum, ultimum, media,* ſaith their Romane [a] *Thraſo*; Generall Councils are all ours, the firſt, the laſt, & the middle. *Alls mine*, as ſaid the Devill to the Collier. A vaunt too vaine, too Thraſonicall. Divide the Councils aright, and let each have his own due part and portion, and then all the five firſt, and ſo much as they account the ſixt, that is, all which were held for 600. yeares and more; All the golden Councils, and of the golden ages of the Church, are ours onely, and not theirs, in many and even in the maine points of Religion, repugnant to them and their doctrines: but in every Decree, Canon, and Conſtitution of faith, ſo conſonant to us, that we not onely embrace, but earneſtly defend them all, as the rightfull and proper inheritance left unto us by thoſe holy Fathers of the ancient and Catholike Church. The middle ranke, beginning at the ſecond *Nicene*, unto the Councill of *Florence*, which were held in thoſe ages of the mingled and confuſed Church, none of them are either wholly ours or wholly theirs, thoſe miſcellane Councils, are neither thine nor mine, but they muſt all be divided. The two laſt, the one at *Laterane*, the other at *Trent*, which are the very lees and dreggs of Councills, held onely by ſuch as were the droſſe of the Church quite ſevered from the gold, wee willingly yeeld unto them: they and they onely are wholly theirs, let them have, let them enjoy their *Helenaes*, we envy not ſuch refuſe Councils unto them.

[a] Camp. Ra'. 4.

2. When firſt I ſet my ſelfe to the handling of this argument

concerning the Councils, it was my purpoſe, beſides thoſe other generall queſtions, concerning the right of calling generall Councils, the right of Preſidencie in them, and the right of confirming them, to have made manifeſt thoſe three ſeverall points, touching thoſe three rankes of Councils; every one of which, is not onely true, but even demonſtrable in it ſelfe. And though with a delightfull kind of toile I have made no ſmall progreſſe therein, yet alas, how unequall am I to ſuch an *Herculean* labour? whoſe time, whoſe ſtrength of body, or induſtry of minde, is able to accompliſh a worke of ſuch amplitude, and of ſo vaſt extent, for which not *Neſtors* age would ſuffice? Wherefore turning my ſailes, from this ſo long, and tedious a voyage, which I could not ſo much as hope to end, & which beſide many dangerous rockes, hidden Syrtes and ſands, is every where beſet by many Romane enemies, ſpecially by *Baronius* the Archpirate of this and former ages, with whom at every turne, almoſt, one ſhall be ſure to have an hot encounter; I thought a ſhorter courſe far more fit, for my ſmall and unfurniſht barke, and deſpairing of more or longer voyages, I ſhall be glad if God will enable me to make but a cut onely over ſome one arme of that great Ocean, not doubting but the ice being once broken, and the paſſage through theſe ſtraits opened, many other will with more facilitie, and felicitie alſo, performe the like in the reſt, untill the whole journey through every part of theſe ſeas be at length fully accompliſhed.

3. Among all the Councils I have for ſundry reaſons made choice of the fift, held at *Conſtantinople* in the time of the Emperor *Iuſtinian* and Pope *Vigilius*, for authoritie equall to the former, it being, as well as they, approved by the conſenting judgement of the Catholike Church; for antiquitie venerable, being held within 600. yeares after Chriſt, even in thoſe times while as yet the droſſe had not prevailed and got the predominancie above the gold, as in the ſecond *Nicene* Synod and ſucceeding ages it did: for varietie of weighty and important matters, more delightfull then any of the reſt; and, which I moſt reſpected of them all, moſt apt to make manifeſt the truth and true Iudgement of the ancient and Catholike Church touching thoſe Controverſies of the Popes ſupremacy of authority and infallibility of judgement, which are of all other moſt ventilated in theſe dayes.

4. The occaſion of this Councill were thoſe *Tria capitula*, as they were called, which bred exceeding much and long trouble to the whole Church: to wit, The perſon and writings of *Theodorus B. of Mopſveſtia* long before dead: the writings of *Theodoret B. of Cyrus* againſt *Cyril*: and the Epiſtle of *Ibas B. of Edeſſa* unto *Maris*: all which three Chapters were mentioned in the Councill at [b] *Chalcedon*.

[b] *Act.* 8, 9, 10.

5. The *Neſtorians* (whoſe hereſie was condemned in the third generall Councill) when they could no longer under the name of

of *Neſtorius* countenance their hereſie, very ſubtilly indevored to [c] revive the ſame, by commending *Theodorus B. of Mopſveſtia* and his writings, as alſo the writings of *Theodoret* againſt *Cyrill* and the Epiſtle of *Ibas* unto *Maris*. This after the Councill of *Chalcedon* they more earneſtly applyed, then before, pretending [d] that not onely the perſons of *Theodoret* and *Ibas* (who both had ſometimes beene very earneſt for *Neſtorius* and his hereſies) but that the writings alſo of *Theodoret* and the Epiſtle of *Ibas*, which is full fraught with *Neſtorianiſme*, and wherein *Theodorus* with his hereticall writings are greatly extolled, were received and approved in that famous Councill. And in truth the *Neſtorians* little leſſe then triumphed herein, and inſulted over Catholikes, thinking by this meanes either to diſgrace and utterly overthrow the Councill of *Chalcedon*, if their doctrine were rejected; or, if that Councill were imbraced, together with it, and under the colour and authoritie of it, to renew and eſtabliſh the doctrine of *Neſtorius*, which (as they boaſted) that councill had certainly confirmed, by their approving that Epiſtle of *Ibas*.

6. By occaſion hereof, many who were weake in faith began to doubt of the credit and authority of that moſt holy councill: and thoſe, as *Leontius* [e] ſheweth, were called *Hæſitantes*, waverers or Doubters: Many others (who for other cauſes diſtaſted that Councill) were hereby incouraged pertinaciouſly to reject the ſame, as [f] *Liberatus* declareth. Such were the *Agnoites*, *Gainites*, *Theodoſians*, *Themiſtians*, and other like Sectaries, called all by the common name of *Acephali*, becauſe they had no one head by whom to be directed. All theſe, though being at mortall wars one with another, yet herein conſpired to oppugne the faith, and the holy Councill of *Chalcedon*, taking now advantage of that which the *Neſtorians* every where boaſted, and theſe men gladly beleeved, that in it the Epiſtle of *Ibas* (which maintaineth all the blaſphemies of *Neſtorius*) was approved. Thus the Church was by contrary enemies, on every ſide aſſailed, and ſo extremely diſturbed, that as the Emperor [g] teſtifieth, it was in a manner rent even from Eaſt to Weſt, yea the Eaſt [h] was rent from the Weſt.

7. *Iuſtinian* the religious Emperor, knowing [i] how much it was available not onely for his honor, and the tranquillitie of his empire, but for the good of the whole Church, and glory of God, to appeaſe all thoſe broiles: and knowing further, that the holy Councill of *Chalcedon*, though it received the perſons of *Theodoret* and *Ibas*, after that they had publickly renounced the hereſie of *Neſtorius*, yet, did utterly condemne both that Impious Epiſtle of *Ibas*, as alſo the perſon and doctrines of *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia* (both which that Epiſtle defendeth) together with the writings of *Theodoret* againſt *Cyrill*: he knowing and that exactly

c *Neſtorij ſequaces propriam impietatē applicare volentes ſanctæ Dei Eccleſiæ, & non potentes hoc per Neſtorium facere, feſtinaverunt eam introducere per Theodorum Mopſveſtenum, necnon per impiæ ſcripta Theodoreti, & per ſceleratam Epiſtolam quæ dicitur Ibæ ad Marin. Iuſt. Ep. ad Syn. 5. Col. 1. pa. 519. b. Lē habet Concilium ipſum in ſua ſententia definitiva. Col. 8 pa. 584. & Lib. c. 10*

d *Theodori et Neſtorij ſequaces conantur dicere ſuſceptam eſſe eam (Epiſtolam Ibæ) à 5. Chalcedonenſi Conc. nomine ejus Theodorum & Neſtorium condemnatione liberare feſtinantes. Iuſt. Ediſt §. Tali. Et iterum Epiſt. Iuſt. ad Synod. Col. 1. pa 519 b. Et Dicebant iſtam impiam Epiſtolam quæ laudat et defendit Theodorum et Neſtorium et eorum impietatem ſuſceptam eſſe à Synodo Chalc. Conc. 5. Col. 8 pa. 585. b.*

e *Lib de ſect. act. 6.*

f *Illi (Acephali) hoc offenduntur in Syn. Chalced quod laudes ſuſcepit Theodori Mopſveſt. Epiſtolam que Ibæ, quæ per omnia Neſtoriana eſſe cognoſcitur. lib. Brev ca. 24.*

g *Sacerdotes ſanctarum Dei Eccleſiarum ab Oriente uſq; ad Occidentem diviſi, Iuſt. Epiſt. ad Synod. pa 519. b.*

h *Ob tria Capitula inter ſe invicem tam in oriente quam in occidente fideles ſuerunt ſciſſi atq; ſchiſmate ſeparati. Bar. an. 547. nu. 19.*

i *Initium et fundamentum noſtri imperij ſetimus, conjungere diviſos Sacerdotes. Epiſt. ad Synod. Col. 1.*

Vniverſus fere orbis occidentalis ab orientali eccleſia diviſus erat. Bin not. in 5. Conc. § Concilium.

actly all theſe particulars, that he might draw all the ſubjects of his Empire to the unitie of that moſt holy faith which was decreed at *Chalcedon*, ſet forth an [k] Imperiall Edict containing a moſt orthodoxall, religious and holy profeſſion, or rather an ample Declaration of his, nay not his, but of the Catholike Faith. Among many other things, the Emperor in that Edict did particularly and expreſly condemne *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia* with his doctrines, the writings of *Theodoret* againſt *Cyril*, and that moſt impious Epiſtle of *Ibas*, accurſing [l] all theſe as hereticall, and all thoſe, who either had heretofore, or ſhould therafter maintaine or defend them, or any one of them.

k *Extat apud Bin. tom. 2. Conc. pa. 492.*

l *Si quis defendit Theodorum, &c. anathema ſit, Edict. pa. 196.*

8. But notwithſtanding all this, which the Emperor with great prudence, piety and zeale performed, very many, even ſome of thoſe who bare the names of orthodoxall and Catholike Biſhops, were ſo far from conſenting to this Imperial Edict, and the Catholike truth delivered therein, that they openly oppugned his Edict, and defended the Three Chapters (by him condemned and anathematized) by words, by writings, by all meanes which they could deviſe, publiſhing libels and bitter invectives againſt it and the Emperor himſelfe alſo. He ſeeing ſo generall a diſturbance in his Empire, and the whole Church to be in a combuſtion about this cauſe, to end and quiet all, uſed that which is the beſt and laſt publick meanes which is left to the Church for deciding any doubt or controverſie of faith, and of purpoſe to determine this ſo weighty a cauſe (whether thoſe *Three Chapters* were to be condemned or allowed) he aſſembled this fifth and holy generall Councill, whereof, God aſſiſting us, we are now to entreat.

Cap. II.

That the Fift Generall Councill, when Pope Vigilius *refuſed to come unto it, was held without the Popes preſence therein, either by himſelfe or by his Legates.*

1. THat this Council was celebrated when Pope *Vigilius* was at *Conſtantinople*; that he was once, againe, often and earneſtly, invited to the *Synod*, but wilfully refuſed to be preſent either perſonally or by his deputies, the Acts of the Councill doe abundantly witneſſe. The holy Synod ſaid [a] thus, *Sæpius petivimus. We have often entreated the moſt holy Pope Vigilius; to come together with us and make a determination of theſe matters.* Againe, the holy Synod ſaid, [b] *The moſt glorious Iudges and certaine of us (ſæpius adhortati ſunt Vigilium) have often exhorted Vigilius, to come and debate and make an end of this cauſe touching the Three Chapters.* Neither did they onely invite, exhort, and entreat him; but in the Emperors name they commanded him to come to the Synod: *We being preſent*

a *Coll. 2. pa. 524. a.*

b *Col. 1. pa. 521. b. & Coll. 8. pa. 584. b.*

preſent (ſaid [c] the *Biſhops*, who were ſent unto him) *Liberius, Peter,* and *Patricius, propoſuerunt Iuſſionem pijſſimi Imperatoris ſanctiſſimo Papæ, propoſed to the moſt holy Pope Vigilius the command of the moſt holy Emperor.* If all this ſeeme not enough, the Emperor himſelfe teſtifieth [d] the ſame, *Mandavimus illi, we have commanded Vigilius, both by our Iudges, and by certaine of your ſelves* (he writ this to the Synod) *ut una cum omnibus conveniret, that he ſhould come together with all the reſt,* in common to debate and determine this cauſe touching the *Three Chapters.*

c *Coll.* 2. *pa.* 524. *a.*

d *Epiſt. Iuſtin. ad Conc. Coll.* 1. *pa.* 520. *a.*

2. What Pope *Vigilius* did, after ſo many invitations, entreaties, and commands, *Card. Bellarmine* doth declare, The Pope, ſaith he, [e] *neq; per ſe, neq; per legatos interfuit, was not preſent in the Council either by himſelfe, or by his legats.* And more clearly in another place, *The Pope,* ſaith he, [f] *was then at Conſtantinople, ſed noluit intereſſe, but he would not be preſent in the Councill. Binius* teſtifieth [g] the ſame. *At the fifth Councill Vigilius was not preſent either by himſelfe or by his deputies.* And *Baronius, The Pope* (ſaith he) [h] *noluit intereſſe, would not be preſent either by himſelfe, or by any to ſupply his place.* And this Cardinall adds [i] not without ſome choler, *The members aſſembled without the head, nulla Vigilij ægrotantis adhuc habita ratione, having no regard at all to Pope Vigilius then ſick.*

e *Lib* 1. *de Conc. ca.* 5. § *Coacta.*

f *Lib. eod.* 19. § *Adde.*

g *Notis in Conc. gen.* 5. § *Præſedit.*

h *Anno* 553. *nu.* 29

i *Ibid. nu.* 31.

3. What? doth the Card. complaine that they had no regard of him, when himſelfe a little before profeſſeth, *noluit intereſſe, he himſelfe was not willing to be preſent?* Or had they no regard of him when before ever they aſſembled or ſate in the Synod, they writ an Epiſtle [k] unto him entreating his preſence, and with their own requeſt, ſignified [l] the Emperors command, wil, and pleaſure to him, that he ſhold come together with the reſt? when after they were aſſembled in the Synod, they ſo often, ſo earneſtly invited, and even entreated him to come together with them? when they whom they ſent to invite him were no meane, no ordinary meſſengers neither for their number nor dignitie, but twenty reverend Biſhops, all of them *Metropolitanes,* as the *Cardinal* [m] both knew, and acknowledged, & the Synodall acts [n] doe witneſſe, and of thoſe twenty, three were *Patriarks, Eutychius,* of *Conſtantinople, Apollinarius,* of *Alexandria,* and *Domninus,* of *Antioch?* Was this a ſigne that they had no regard of *Vigilius?* when beſides all this, in token of their moſt earneſt deſire of his preſence, among divers other they propoſed two moſt effectuall reaſons to induce him to come. The one, the promiſe of Preſidencie among them, which ſo far as in them lay, they offred unto him, ſaying, [o] *Petimus præſidente nobis veſtra beatitudine, we entreat that your holineſſe being preſent in this Synod, the queſtion may be debated and have an end:* The other (which ſhould not onely in equitie, but even in common honeſty have prevailed with a Pope) for that himſelfe had promiſed and that under his owne hand-writing, that he would come to the *Synod:* we told him (ſaid [p] the Biſhop) *your holineſſe knoweth, quod*

k *Epiſt. Eutychij ad Vigilium lecta Coll.* 1. *ideoq; miſſa ante inchoatum Synodū.*

l *Et primo die inſtantis Maij pervenimus ad Vigilium: —Diximus, Pijſſimus Dominus vult te unà cum alijs cōvenire: propoſuerunt juſſionem pijſſimi Imperatoris. Coll.* 2. *pa.* 523. *b.* 524. *a. Concilium vero cœpit* 4. *die Maij. Coll.* 1.

m *Miſſi ſunt qui cum vocarent Epiſcopi numero viginti, ijdemq; Metropolitani. Bar. an.* 553. *nu.* 35.

n *Coll.* 1. *&* 2. *nam in utraq; miſſi ſunt.*

o *Coll.* 1. *pa.* 521. *a.*

p *Coll.* 2. *pa.* 523. *b.*

quod in his quæ inter nos in ſcriptis facta ſunt, promiſiſtis; that in thoſe things which were done in writing betwixt us, you have promiſed to come together with the reſt and diſcuſſe theſe three Chapters. And a-
q Coll. 8. pa. 584. a gaine, we entreated his reverence (ſay the whole Synod) q *ſcriptas ſuas promiſsiones adimplere; to performe that which in his writing he had promiſed.*

4. Had they no regard of ſick Vigilius, whoſe infirmity being ſignified to the Synod at their firſt ſeſſion, they forthwith concluded that Seſſion, ſaying, r *Oportet, we muſt defer the examination of the cauſe to another day?* And whereas the Pope r promiſed to give them an anſwer the next day, then becauſe his qualme was overpaſt, he found new excuſes for his abſence: one becauſe t there was but a few weſterne Biſhops then preſent with them; another becauſe u he would himſelf alone declare his judgement in writing, and offer it to the Emperor, for which cauſe he had entreated reſpite for certaine dayes of his highneſſe. Both which were in truth nothing elſe but meere repretēces, as the Biſhops thē ſent, manifeſtly declared unto him. For both the Emperor, ſaid they, *vult te in cōmuni convenire; will have you to come together with the reſt*, & therefore he ought not to have given his ſentēce alone but in common and in the Synod: and for his other excuſe, *Baronius* x himſelfe doubteth not to call that a *pretence:* for ſo it was indeed, ſeeing as the Biſhops truly told y him, in none of the former Councils there was any multitude of Weſterne Biſhops, but onely two or three, and ſome Clerkes, whereas at that time, there were preſent with the Pope at *Conſtantinople* z many *Italian* Biſhops, others out of *Africk*, others out of *Illirium*, for their number more then had beene in al the foure former Councills; whereupon they plainly and truly told a the Pope to his face, *Nihil eſt quod prohibet vos convenire una nobiſcum; there is no ſufficient or allowable cauſe to ſtay you from comming to the Synod together with us:* not ſickneſſe, not want of Weſtern Biſhops, *Nihil eſt*, there is nothing elſe at all but an unwilling mind. So extraordinary reſpect had they of the Pope at this time, and ſo earneſt were they to have him preſent in the Synod, of whom *Baronius* without any regard of truth ſhamed not to ſay, that they aſſembled having no reſpect at all unto ſick *Vigilius*.

r *Coll.* 1. *in fine.*

s *Poſtero die pollicitus eſt manifeſtare, quod ei de tali conventu placuerit. Coll.* 1.

t *Ille reſpondit non poſſe nobiſcum convenire, eo quod plurimi quidē hîc ſunt Orientales Epiſcopi, pauci vero cum eo. Coll.* 2. *pa.* 523. *a.*

u *Dicebat facere ſe per ſemetipſam in ſcriptis, & offerre Imperatori, iaeo enim & indutias ſe poſtulaſſe ab ejus ſerenitate. Ibid.*

x *Eam ſuæ abſentiæ cauſam prætexuiſſe. an.* 553. *nu.* 36.

y *Nec in ſanctis* 4. *Synodis multitudo Occidentalium Epiſcoporum inventa eſt unquam, ſed duo vel tres Epiſcopi. Col.* 2. *pa.* 523. *b.*

z *Nunc vero adſunt multi ex Italia Epiſcopi, ſunt etiam ex Africa, & ex Illyrico. Ibid.*

a *Ibid. Col.* 2.

5. The true reaſon which made the Pope ſo unwilling to be preſent in the Synod, and why *Noluit intereſſe*, was indeed his hereticall affection and adverſnes from the truth in this cauſe of the *Three Chapters*. He ſaw the Catholike Biſhops, then aſſembled, to be bent and forward (as their dutie was) for condemning thoſe *Chapters*, which himſelfe embraced and defended: he therefore thought it fit to ſeparate himſelfe from them in place, from whom in judgement and in the doctrine of faith he was ſo farre disjoyned and ſevered. This to have beene the onely true cauſe of his wilfull abſence and of his *Noluit intereſſe* the ſequell of this Treatiſe will make moſt evident. For this time it is ſufficient, by all thoſe honorable invitations, earneſt perſwaſi-

ons,

ons, and Imperiall commands, to have declared that as the holy Synod for their part was moſt deſirous of his preſence, ſo he not onely was abſent, but in meere ſtomacke, wilfulneſſe and perverſneſſe, abſented himſelfe from the Holy Councill at this time.

CAP. III.

That Pope VIGILIVS, *during the time of the fift Councill, publiſhed his* Apoſtolicall Conſtitution *in defence of the* Three Chapters.

1. WHen Pope *Vigilius* remaining then at *Conſtantinople* where the Councill was held, by no intreaties, perſwaſions nor Imperiall commands could be brought to the Synod, having no other let, as before was declared, but his owne wilfulneſſe, the holy *Synod* reſolved[a] without him to debate and judge the Controverſie then referred unto them. And in truth what elſe was to be done in that caſe? The Emperor commanded[b] them not to delay nor protract the time, but deliver a ſpeedy, yet withall a ſound and true judgement in that cauſe. The neceſſity of the Church required this, which was now in a generall[c] tumult and Schiſme about thoſe *Three Chapters*. The *Neſtorians* on one ſide triumphed as if the Councill of Chalcedon had approved the Epiſtle of *Ibas*, and thereby confirmed their hereſies. The *Acephali* on another ſide rejected that Councill, as favoring the *Neſtorians* by approving that impious Epiſtle. The wavering *Heſitantes* were in a maze, not knowing which way to turne themſelves, whether allow the Councill of Chalcedon with the *Neſtorians*, or with the *Acephali* reject it. The Catholikes againſt all theſe Sectaries, both defended the Councill of *Chalcedon*, and yet rejected that impious Epiſtle and the *two other Chapters*. In ſuch a generall rent and contention of all ſides, what delay could the Church endure? which the Councill rightly conſidering,[d] ſaid, That it was not juſt nor fit by delaying their judgement, to ſuffer either the Emperor or the faithful people any longer to be ſcandalized. And for the abſence of *Vigilius*, they knew right well that which Card. *Cuſanus* very truly obſerveth,[e] *that if the Pope, being invited, did not, or would not come, or ſend to a Synod, but wilfully refuſed to come, in this caſe the Councill without him muſt provide for the peace of the Church and ſafety of the Chriſtian faith.* They had a very memorable example hereof, as yet but freſh before their eyes, when the Popes legats being preſent at *Chalcedon* were[f] invited and intreated to be preſent at the Synod there held (which was the very next before this) at the debating of the right and preeminence of the Sea of *Conſtantinople* but wilfully refuſed to be

a *Deo juvante, ſuturo die convenientes, quæ oportet agemus. Col. 2. in fine*

b *Celeriter de his quæ interrogavimus veſtram manifeſtate voluntatem. Iuſt. ep. ad Synod. Col. 1. pa. 520. b.*

c *Ob tria capitula fideles fuerunt ſciſſi atque ſchiſmate ſeparati. Bar. an. 547. nu. 29.*

d *Nec enim juſtum eſt vel Imperatorem vel fidelē populum ex dilatione ſcandalizari. Co. 2. p. 533. b*

e *Alioqui ſi expectatus non mitteret, vel non veniret, vel nollet, Concilium congregatum ſuæ neceſſitati, & Eccleſiæ ſaluti providere debet. lib. 2. de Conc. ord. Cath. cap. 2.*

f *Rogavimus dominos Epiſcopos de Roma, ut communicarent iis geſtis. Conc. Chal. act. 16. pa. 134. a.*

be there, ſaying [g] (as *Vigilius* now did) *Non, ſed alia ſe ſuſcepiſſe mandata, No, we will not come, we have a contrary command from pope Leo,* yet that holy Councill of *Chalcedon* handled and defined that cauſe in their abſence, and their determination, notwithſtanding the Popes abſence, was not onely declared [h] by the moſt glorious Iudges to be juſt and Synodall, but the ſame was both by that holy *Synod,* and all other ever ſince, held to be the judgement and definition of the whole generall Councill: for in their Synodal relation to the Pope, ſpeaking of this very decree, they ſay, [i] *Confirmavimus ante, we* (to wit, this whole generall Councill) *have confirmed the ſentence of the* 150. *Biſhops for the prerogative of Conſtantinople.* A moſt cleare and undeniable demonſtration, and that by the warrant of one of the moſt famous Councils that ever were, that the peeviſhnes, perverſnes, or wilfull abſence of one or a few Biſhops, yea of the Pope himſelfe, ought not, nor could not hinder a Synod to judge and determine any needful cauſe; much leſſe a cauſe of faith about which there ſhould happen (as now there did) a general diſturbance of the whole Church. Vpon theſe and other like reaſons the holy Synod now aſſembled at *Conſtantinople,* having done as much as in them lay, yea, as [k] much in all points as was fit to be done for procuring the preſence of *Vigilius,* and having in their firſt and ſecond Seſſions done nothing but waited and expected for his comming; ſeeing now all their invitations and intreaties to be contemned by him, and their longer expectance to be but in vaine, addreſſe themſelves to the examining of the cauſe, being ſtird [l] up by the words of St. [m] *Peter, Be ready alwaies to give an anſwer to every man that asketh you a reaſon of your hope,* which readineſſe if it muſt be in al Chriſtians, much [n] more in Biſhops: and if it muſt be declared towards all men, moſt of all towards the Emperor, who now required their ſpeedy judgement and Synodall reſolution in this cauſe.

2. Having in their firſt and ſecond Seſſions declared their long and earneſt, but vaine expectance of *Vigilius,* In their *third Collation* (ſo their Seſſions are called) they ſet downe as a foundation to all their future acts, a moſt holy confeſſion of their faith, conſonant in all points to that which the holy Apoſtles preached, which the foure former Councils explained, and which the Holy Fathers with uniforme conſent maintained.

3. In the 4. and 5. *Collations,* they at large and very exactly diſcuſſe the *firſt Chapter,* concerning the perſon and writings of *Theodorus B. of Mopſveſtia,* adding ſo much alſo as was needfull touching the *ſecond Chapter,* which concerned the writings of *Theodoret* againſt *Cyril.*

4. Now in that fifth *Collation,* as *Baronius* tells [o] us, the *Conſtitution* of Pope *Vigilius* touching the *Three Chapters* was brought unto the *Synod.* The Pope promiſed [p] that he would ſend his judgement thereof, *ad ipſum Imperatorem, atq; ad Synodum; both to the Emperor, and to the Synod;* which he ingenuouſly per-

g *Ibid.*

h *Viri illuſtriſſimi Iudices dixerunt, quod interlocuti ſumus tota Synodus approbavit. Ibid. pa.* 137. *b.*

i *Ibid. pa.* 140. *a.*

e *Cum nos per omnia, quod decet, & ſervavimus & ſervamus, & ſæpius petivimus Vigilium. Col.* 2. *pa.* 524. *a.*

l *Pa. eadem. b.*

m 1 Pet. 3. 15.

n *Incongruum autẽ Sacerdotibus eſſe putantes protrahere dandum à nobis reſponſum Chriſtianiſſimo Imperatori pa. eadem.*

o *Vigilij libellus oblatus Synodo. Bar. an.* 553. *nu.* 47.

p *Ibid.*

performed; yea [q], *modo opportunè præſtandum putavit, he did it opportunely at this very time of the* 5. *Collation:* And the *Card.* is ſo reſolute in this point, that he peremptorily affirmeth of the Popes *Conſtitution*, *Cognoſcitur*, [r] *its knowne to pertaine to this very day of their fift Collation:* and it [s] was this day offered to the Councill: for which cauſe he ſtrongly imagining this *Conſtitution* [t] to be ſtolne out of the Synodall acts now extant, is bold to inſert [u] it into the 5. *Collation*; as into his owne due and proper place, wherein it was, and now ought to be.

q *An. eod. nu.* 48

r *Ibid.*

s *Anno eod. nu.* 41.

t *Conſtitutum hoc ex actis* 5. *Synodi noſcitur eſſe ſublatum. an. eod. nu.* 47.

u *Cum ad hunc ipſum annum et diem Collationis* 5. *pertinere cognoſcitur. Ibid. nu.* 48.

5. The *Card.* is too confident about the day when it was ſent to the Synod, as alſo in his adding this *Conſtitution* to the Acts of the Synod, as hereafter in due place will appeare. Thus much is certaine and evident by the Synodall acts, that this *Conſtitution* of *Vigilius* was made knowne to the Biſhops of this holy Councill, before their ſixt *Collation*, for in that ſixt, divers things are expreſſed, which have a cleare and undoubted reference to the Popes decree, as containing a refutation of the ſame, and herein the *Card.* ſaith truly, The [x] *decree* of *Vigilius* was firſt ſent to the Emperor, and from him to the Synod, as by the ſixt *Collation* may be perceived, wherein thoſe things which the Pope had alledged for defence of the Epiſtle of *Ibas*, are refuted.

x *An.* 553 *nu.* 210.

y *Quæ præſenti ſtatuimus Conſtituto. Vig. Conſt. apud Bar. an.* 553. *nu.* 208.

z *Statuimus et decernimus. ibid.*

a *Poſt præſentem definitionem. ibid.*

6. As for the dignity, credit and authority of this writing, it is neither any ordinary nor private inſtruction, but as the Pope himſelfe calleth it, a *Conſtitution*; [y] a *Statute*, [z] a *Decree*, a *Definition*, [a] or Definitive ſentence: and by the name of a *Conſtitution*, it is ſubſcribed unto, both by the Pope [b] and all [c] the reſt of his Aſſemblie; and for ſuch it is commended by *Card.* [d] *Baronius* and *Binius* [e]. In it the Pope delivereth his *Apoſtolicall* ſentence & Iudgement touching the *Three Chapters*, this being [f] that very ſame anſwer which *Vigilius* promiſed to ſend to the Emperor, and for the adviſed ſetting downe whereof, he [g] requeſted of the Emperor the reſpite of twenty dayes. During which time he did *inſudare* and *laborare*, as the *Card.* ſaith, [h] with much ſweat and toile elaborate this large decree, (containing no leſſe [i] then thirty ſix columes *in folio*) that it might in every reſpect, and for the exact handling of ſo weighty a cauſe, be correſpondent to the gravity and authority of his *infallible* Chaire, ſpecially ſeeing he ſet it forth of purpoſe, that it might be notified [k] not onely to the Emperor and the Synod then aſſembled, *ſed univerſo orbi Catholico, but to the whole Catholike Church*, as a publike direction in faith for them all; in which kinde of teaching, *nullo caſu errare poteſt*, ſaith *Card. Bellarmine*, [l] *the Pope can by no meanes be poſſibly deceived.* For this cauſe alſo *Vigilius* at this time, and in this buſineſſe, uſed the help and advice of a Synod, conſiſting of *Italian*, *Africane*, and *Illyrian* Biſhops, then preſent with him at *Conſtantinople*, ſixteene Biſhops beſide himſelfe, and three *Romane* Deacons. Theſe all conſented with the Pope, and ſubſcribed [m] to his *Conſtitution*; and in theirs was included the conſent of the *Africane*, of the *Illyrian*, of the *Italian*, and other Weſterne

b *Vigilius Epiſcopus huic Conſtituto noſtro ſubſcripſi. ib. nu.* 209.

c *Iohannes Marſennum huic Conſtituto ſubſcripſi, & alij ſimiliter. Ibid.*

d *Ann.* 553. *nu.* 47.

e *Vigilij Papæ Conſtitutum. Bin. in Fragm.* 5. *Conc. pa.* 591.

f *Hunc ipſum eſſe ſcias, quem de ſua ſententia interpellatum, pollicitus eſt ſe miſſurum ad Imperatorem. Bar. ann.* 553. *nu.* 47.

g *Conſt. Vigil. nu.* 58.

h *Ann.* 553. *nu.* 28.

i *Apud Bar. nu.* 553 *a nu.* 50. *ad* 210.

k *Bar. an.* 553. *nu.* 47

l *Lib.* 4. *de Pont. Rom. ca.* 3. § *Sit.*

m *Vide ſubſcriptiones loc. cit. nu.* 209.

Weſterne Churches, even of the Church of *Rome* alſo, who all at this time agreed in judgement about the *Three Chapters* with the Pope, as *Card. Baronius* profeſſeth [n]. So deliberate and adviſed was the Pope in this cauſe, that his reſolution herein is not onely a Pontificall, but a Synodall Sentence alſo, yea a Decree and definitive judgement delivered by the Pope, as himſelfe expreſly witneſſeth, [o] *Ex authoritate ſedis Apoſtolicæ; by the authoritie of the Apoſtolicke ſea,* an whole Synod of Biſhops (the Weſterne Churches conſenting with them) ſubſcribing to the ſame, for their number, well-neere [p] as many, as there were Biſhops preſent in ſome Seſſions of their Oecumenicall Councill at Trent.

n *Occidentales perſtabant in ſententia quâ ſemper fuerant pro trium defenſione capitulorum. an. 547 nu. 38.*

o *Vigilij Conſt. apud Bar. loc. cit. nu. 209.*

p *In Seſſ. 1. Conc. Trid. Archiepiſcopi & Epiſcopi non plures quam 26. ut ex actis liquet.*

7. This *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution*, which had long laid in obſcuritie, about ſome 18. yeares ſince was brought to light, and firſt [q] of al publiſhed by *Card. Baronius* to the opē view of the world, copied by him out of an ancient [r] manuſcript in their *Vaticane*, where ſtill it is kept: and more then halfe of it, is ſet out by *Binius* [s], annexed as a fragment to the fifth generall Councill. But for what good purpoſe *Binius* clipt away the reſidue, being a great (no leſſe then five or ſix columes *in folio*) and by farre the moſt needfull part of the Popes *Decree*, thereby not onely injuring the Popes Holines, and deluding the world, but foully maiming and diſgracing his owne Tomes of the Councils, you will eaſily perceive hereafter.

q *Bar. an. 553. nu. 48.*

r *Ibidem.*

s *To. 2. pa. 591.*

8. The ſumme and effect of the Popes *Conſtitution* is the Defence of thoſe *three Chapters*, which the Emperor by his moſt religious Edict had condemned and accurſed. The Pope, ſaith *Baronius*, [t] during the time of the Synod, ſet forth *Decretum pro defenſione trium Capitulorum, his decree for defence of the Three Chapters*. Againe, [u] *Vigilius* made knowne to the whole Church *pro Tribus Capitulis Conſtitutum à ſe editum, his Conſtitution publiſhed in defence of the Three Chapters*. Againe, [x] *pro ipſorum defenſione laborat; Vigilius labored for defence of the Three Chapters*. But the *Conſtitution* it ſelfe maketh this moſt evident.

t *An. 553. nu. 218.*

v *Ibid. nu. 218.*

x *Ibid. nu. 272.*

9. Concerning the *firſt Chapter*, whether *Theodorus* (being dead more then an hundred yeares before this Council) ought to be condemned, *Vigilius* thus decreed, *Nulli* [y] *licere noviter aliquid de mortuorum judicare perſonis, That it is not lawfull for any to judge ought anew of thoſe perſons who are dead*, that is, not to condemne thoſe, who, as *Vigilius* explaining himſelfe ſaith, [z] *minime reperiuntur in vita damnati, are not found to have beene condemned while they lived*. This for the generality of the dead: particularly for *Theodorus B. of Mopſveſtia* he thus decreed [a], Seeing the holy Fathers had not, (as he ſaith) condemned him, *eum noſtra non audemus damnare ſententia, we dare not condemne him by our ſentence, ſed nec ab alio quopiam condemnari concedimus; neither doe we permit that any other ſhall condemne him.*

y *Vigilij Conſt. apud Bar. an. 553. nu. 179.*

z *Ibid. nu. 176.*

a *Ibid. nu. 175.*

10. For the *ſecond Chapter* which concernes the writings of *Theodoret* againſt *Cyrill*, *Vigilius* was ſo tender of the credit of *Theodoret*, that he would by no meanes permit his name to be blemiſhed

blemiſhed by cõdemning his writings, ſeeing as he ſaith, [b] *neither Cyril himſelf, nor after him the Councill of Chalcedon had condemned them.* Nay *Vigilius* further adds, [c] that it is *valde contrarium & indubitanter inimicum*; *very contrary and undoubtedly repugnant* to the judgement of the Councill at *Chalcedon*, to condemne any *Neſtorian* doctrines under the name of *Theodoret*. Whereupon he definitively decreeth in this manner [d]; *Statutimus atq; decernimus, we ordaine and decree* that no injury or ſlaunder ſhall by any man be raiſed, or uttered againſt *Theodoret, ſub taxatione nominis ejus, by taxing of his name.* So *Vigilius*, decreeing that the condemning of thoſe writings of *Theodoret* againſt *Cyril*, is an injury to *Theodoret*.

b *Ibid. nu.* 181.

c *Nu.* 180.

d *Nu.* 182.

11. The *third Chapter* (which indeed is the moſt materiall, but withall moſt intricate and obſcure) concerns the Epiſtle written againſt *Cyril* and the holy *Epheſine Synod*, by *Ibas* B. of *Edeſſa* unto *Maris* a Perſian and an Hereticke: the copie whereof is ſet downe in the 1c. Action of the Councill at *Chalcedon*, and repeated in the 6. *Collation* of this fift Councill: What the Pope decrees herein, *Baronius* doth declare, who explaining the words and meaning of *Vigilius*, ſaith, [e] *That the Fathers of Chalcedon, dixerunt eam Epiſtolam ut Catholicam recipiendam*; *ſaid* that this Epiſtle of *Ibas* was to be received as Catholike; and further adds, [f] *Ex eâ Ibam comprobatum eſſe Catholicum*; *that by this Epiſtle Ibas himſelfe was proved to be a Catholike*, yea that [g] he was ſo proved by the conſenting judgement of all the Biſhops at *Chalcedon*. So *Baronius*.

e *Ann.* 553. *nu.* 191

f *Ibid. nu.* 196.

g *An.* 448. *nu.* 71.

12. This to have beene indeed the true meaning of Pope *Vigilius*, his owne words in his *Conſtitution* make manifeſt. There he firſt ſets downe the ground of his ſentence, and that was the ſayings of *Paſcaſinus* and *Maximus* in the Councill at *Chalcedon*. The [h] Popes legats ſaid by *Paſcaſinus*, *Relecta ejus epiſtolâ agnovimus eum orthodoxum*; *By the Epiſtle of Ibas now read, we acknowledge him to be orthodoxall*: *Maximus* ſaid, [i] *Ex relecto reſcripto epiſtolæ, orthodoxa eſt ejus declarata dictatio*; *by the Epiſtle of Ibas now read, his Epiſtle or writing is declared to be orthodoxall. Vigilius* grounding himſelfe on theſe two ſpeaches, collects and ſets downe two poſitions of his owne, concerning this third *Chapter*; The former, that the Councill of *Chalcedon* approved that Epiſtle of *Ibas* as orthodoxall, to which purpoſe hee ſaith, the [k] Fathers of the Council at *Chalcedon*, *Epiſtolam pronunciantes orthodoxam, pronounced this Epiſtle to be orthodoxall*: and yet more plainly, *Orthodoxa eſt Ibæ à patribus pronunciata dictatio*; *the Epiſtle or writing of Ibas was pronounced orthodoxall by the Fathers at Chalcedon*; The other, that by this Epiſtle they judged *Ibas* to be a Catholike; to which purpoſe *Vigilius* writeth thus, *Iuvenalis would never have ſaid that Ibas was a Catholike, niſi ex verbis epiſtolæ ejus confeſſionem fidei orthodoxam comprobaret*, Vnles *by the words of his Epiſtle he had proved his faith to be orthodoxall*, which words evidently ſhew that *Vigilius* thought in like ſort all the Biſhops

h *Conſt. Vigil. loco citato nu.* 187.

i *Ibid. nu.* 189.

k *Ibid. nu.* 192.

l *Ibid nu.* 193.

Biſhops at *Chalcedon* to have judged the ſame by the words of that Epiſtle, for it is certaine that they all embraced *Ibas* himſelfe for a Catholike.

13. Hereupon now enſueth the *Definitive* ſentence of *Vigilius* touching this Chapter, in this manner : [m] We following the judgement of the holy Fathers in all things, ſeeing it is a moſt cleare and ſhining truth, *ex verbis Epiſtolæ venerabilis Ibæ*; *by the words of the Epiſtle of the reverend B. Ibas*, being taken in their moſt right and godly ſenſe, and by the acts of *Photius* and *Euſtathius*, and by the meaning of *Ibas* being preſent, that the Fathers at *Chalcedon* did moſt juſtly pronounce the faith of this moſt reverend Biſhop *Ibas* to be orthodoxall, we decree by the authoritie of this our preſent ſentence, that the Iudgement of the Fathers at *Chalcedon* ought to remaine inviolable, both in all other things, and in this Epiſtle of *Ibas* ſo often mentioned. Thus *Vigilius* : decreeing both that this Epiſtle of *Ibas* is Catholike, & that by it & by the words thereof, *Ibas* ought to be judged a Catholike; both which he decreeth upon this ground, that the Councill of *Chalcedon* (as he ſuppoſeth) had judged the ſame.

[m] *Ibid. nu.* 156.

14. In the end, to ratifie and confirme all that concernes any of theſe *Three Chapters* in the Popes *Decree*, he addeth this very remarkable concluſion; [n] *His igitur à nobis cum omni undiq; cautela atq; diligentia diſpoſitis*; *Theſe things being now with all diligence, care and circumſpection diſpoſed, Statuimus et decernimus, we ordaine and decree*, that it ſhall be lawfull for none pertaining to Orders and eccleſiaſticall dignities, either to write, or ſpeake, or teach any thing touching theſe *three Chapters*, contrary to theſe things which by this our preſent *Conſtitution* we have taught and decreed : *aut aliquam poſt præſentem definitionem movere ulterius quæſtionẽ*, neither ſhall it be lawfull for any, *after this our preſent definition, to move any queſtion touching theſe Three Chapters*. But if any thing concerning theſe Chapters be either done, ſaid, or written, or ſhall hereafter be done, ſaid, or written contrary to that which we have here taught and decreed, *hoc modis omnibus ex authoritate ſedis Apoſtolicæ refutamus*; *we by all meanes do reject it by the Authority of the Apoſtolike See*, whereof by Gods grace we have now the government. *So Vigilius*.

[n] *Ibid. nu.* 208.

15. Thinke ye not now, that any Papiſt conſidering this ſo adviſed, elaborate and *Apoſtolicall* decree of Pope *Vigilius*, will be of opinion that there was now a finall end of this matter, and that all doubt concerning theſe *Three Chapters* was for ever now removed : ſeeing the *ſupreme Iudge* had publiſhed for a direction to the whole Church his definitive, Apoſtolicall, and infallible ſentence in this cauſe, what needeth the Councill either to judge, or ſo much as debate this matter after this *Decree*? To define the ſame was needleſſe, more then to light a candle when the Sunne ſhineth in his ſtrength. To define the contrary, were *Hereticall*: yea after ſuch an *authenticall* deciſion and determination

tion, to be doubtfull ° onely what to beleeve, hath the cenſure of an Infidell. But thrice happy was it for the Church of God, that this doctrine of the Popes ſupreme authoritie and infallible Iudgement, was not then either knowne or beleeved. Had it beene, the *Neſtorians* and their hereſie had for ever prevailed, the Catholike faith had beene utterly extinguiſhed, and that without all hope or poſſibility ever after this to have beene revived, ſeeing *Vigilius*, by his *Apoſtolicall* authoritie had ſtopt all mens mouthes from ſpeaking, tyed their hands from writing, yea and their very hearts from beleeving or thinking ought contrary to his *Conſtitution* made in defence of the *Three Chapters*, wherein he hath confirmed all the Blaſphemies of *Neſtorius*, and that by a Decree more irrevocable then thoſe of the *Medes* and *Perſians*. Had the holy Council, at that time aſſembled, beleeved or knowne that doctrine of the Popes ſupremacie and infallible Iudgement, they would not have proceeded one inch further in that buſineſſe, but ſhaking hands with Heretickes, they and the whole Church with them, had beene led in triumph by the *Neſtorians* at that time, under the conduct of Pope *Vigilius*.

° *Dubius in fide infidelis eſt. lib. 5. Dec. tit. 7. de hereticis.*

16. And by this you may conjecture that *Binius* had great reaſon to conceale the later part of the Popes decree, for he might well thinke, as any papiſt will, that it were a foule incongruitie to ſet downe three intire Seſſions of an holy and generall Council, not onely debating this controverſie of faith about the *Three Chapters*, but directly alſo contradicting the Popes *definitive* ſentence in them all, notwithſtanding they knew the Pope by his *Apoſtolicall* authoritie to have delivered his Iudgement, and by the ſame authoritie to have forbidden all men either to write, or ſpeak, or to move any doubt to the contrary, of that which he had now decreed. But let us ſee by a view of the particulars and of their following Seſſions, how this Cathedrall ſentence of the Pope was entertained by the holy generall Councill.

Cap. 4.

That the holy generall Councill in their Synodall Iudgement contradicted the Popes Apoſtolicall Conſtitution *and definitive ſentence, in that cauſe of faith, made knowne unto them.*

1. IN the ſixt, which was the very next Seſſions after they had knowne the Popes will and pleaſure, contrary to the *Apoſtolicall* authoritie and command of *Vigilius*, the Holy Synod began to examine the Epiſtle of *Ibas:* for the cauſes of *Theodorus* and of *Theodoret* were ſufficiently diſcuſſed in their former *Collations*. And firſt of all, alledging a ſaying of the Emperour (to which themſelves doe aſſent) they thus ſay, which being well obſerved gives light to the whole cauſe and openeth both the error of *Vigilius* and the ground thereof. *Becauſe* [a] *the moſt holy Emperor added among thoſe things which he writ unto us, that ſome indevouring to defend the Epiſtle of Ibas, preſume to ſay that it was approved by the holy Councill of Chalcedon, uſing the words of one or two moſt religious Biſhops, who were in that Councill, as ſpoken for that Epiſtle, cum alij omnes, whereas all the reſt were of another minde, we thinke it needfull, this queſtion being propoſed, to recite the Epiſtle of Ibas.* Thus ſaid the Synod, even at the firſt, calling the Popes judgement Preſumption, and checking him both for pretending the Councill of *Chalcedon*, and for alledging the *Interlocutions* of one or two, as the Iudgement of that Councill. For, that the whole Synod conſented to that ſpeech of the Emperor, appeareth both by their owne words, where they ſhew this to be ſo odious an untruth, that they all cried out againſt it, ſaying, [b] The *Decree* of the Councill at *Chalcedon* condemneth this Epiſtle, hee that receiveth this Epiſte rejecteth the Councill at *Chalcedon:* and, by thoſe ſpeeches of *Theodorus* Biſhop of *Ceſarea*, *Andreas* Biſhop of *Epheſus*, and others, to which the whole [c] Synod aſſented, *Quomodo* [d] *præſumunt quidam dicere, How do any preſume to ſay, that this impious Epiſtle of Ibas was approved by the Councill of Chalcedon?* And againe, *Miramur quomodo, we doe even marvell that any will defend this Epiſtle by the name of the Councill at Chalcedon:* and yet more ſharply reproving *Vigilius* with others, for uſing ſo deceitfull a proofe, they adde, *Aſtutia enim hæretica utentes*, for they (who ſo ſay of the Councill at *Chalcedon*) *uſing the fraud and ſubtilitie of heretickes*, doe produce the *Interlocutions* of one or two, as ſpoken for that Epiſtle, whereas this is to be ſet downe for a certaine rule, that in Councills, *non unius aut ſecundi interloquutionem attendere oportet, the ſpeeches of one or two* muſt not be attended, but what is defined by all, or by the greater

a *Col. 6. pa. 561. a.*

b *Col. 6. pa. 576. b.*

c *Sancta Synodus dixit, Scimus et nos hæc ita conſequuta eſſe. Col. 6. p. 564. a.*

d *Col. 6. pa. 563. b.*

ter part of the Councill. And yet further expreſſing their diſlike of that fallacious and ſophiſticall reaſon which *Vigilius* herein uſed, the whole Councill ſaid, The holy [e] Fathers at *Chalcedon* did, *pro nihilo habere, quæ ab uno vel duobus pro eadem Epiſtola dicta ſunt*, did eſteeme as nothing, or made no reckning at all of thoſe things which were ſpoken for that Epiſtle by one or two; And thoſe one or two were *Paſcaſinus* and *Maximus*, on whoſe interlocutions the Pope, as you have formerly ſeene, grounded his decree, concerning this *Chapter*; and if the proofe be of ſo ſmall account by the judgement of that moſt holy Councill, it inevitably followeth, that the *Decree* of *Vigilius* which wholly (for this *Chapter*) relyeth on this proofe, is no better then the ground thereof, that is in very deed, worth nothing at all.

e *Coll. 6. p. 576. a.*

2. Now that all this is purpoſely ſpoken againſt *Vigilius* and his *Conſtitution* (which before this *6 Collation* was made knowne unto them) beſide that it is evident by the Acts themſelves, ſeeing the Councill doth exactly mention, and refute all the principall points on which *Vigilius* doth inſiſt, *Baronius* doth not onely profeſſe, but truly, upon this reaſon, doth prove the ſame: for entreating of this *6.* Seſſion, and mentioning the contents thereof, *This* was done, ſaith he, [d] *as is evident, againſt the Conſtitution of Pope Vigilius (although for reverence they doe not name him) and partly alſo they excuſe him, partly they reprove him, uſing eſpecially this argument, Becauſe in Councils we muſt not attend what one or two ſay, but what is defined by all or the moſt.* Thus *Baronius*; who as he truly acknowlegeth the Council herein to have dealt againſt *Vigilius* and his *Decree*, ſo in the other points, hee bewrayes too great partialitie towards *Vigilius*, for the Councill is ſo far from excuſing the pope, that neither *Baronius* could, nor any of his friends ſhall be ever able to ſhew that excuſe: And for their not naming of *Vigilius*, it proceeded not from any reverence they bare unto him (though in every reſpect they gave him all honour that was due to him, or his place) but the true reaſon thereof was this, becauſe they neither did, nor thought it fit to name any one of thoſe, whom they did condemne, but without mention of their names in particular, condemned them all under one generall Appellation of, *Sequaces* [e] *Neſtorij et Theodori, the followers of Neſtorius and Theodorus*, their Diſciples, or defenders which titles they ſaw the Emperor to have uſed and given unto them before, both in his Edict, and in his [g] Epiſtle to the Synod, which common names to have as fitly and truly agreed to Pope *Vigilius* as to any elſe, the Councill knew right well, ſeeing in every point concerning theſe *Three Chapters*, he wholly agreed with them all. The [h] followers of *Theodorus* and *Neſtorius* pretended, and preſumed to ſay, that the Councill of *Chalcedon* approved the Epiſtle of *Ibas*: *Vigilius* pretended, and preſumed to ſay the ſame; The Fathers at *Chalcedon* (ſaith he) pronounced [i] the Epiſtle of *Ibas* to be *Orthodoxall*. The followers

d *An. 553. nu. 212.*

e *Definitio Synod. Col. 8. pa. 586. a. Defenſores Neſtorij & ejus impietatis, Ibid. pa. 585. b. Theodori diſcipuli. Ibid. & ſæpe alibi.*

f *Theodori & Neſtorij ſequaces. pa. 497. a.*

g *Neſtorij ſequaces. pa. 519. b.*

h *Theodori & Neſtorij defenſores dicebant, &c. Col. 8. pa. 585. b. Et præſumunt dicere, Col. 6. pa. 561. a. & Col. 8. pa. 586. a.*

i *Conſt. Vig. apud Bar. an. 553. nu. 193.*

k *Col. 8. pa. 586. a.* of [k] *Theodorus* and *Neſtorius* fraudulently uſed the *Interlocutions*
l *An. 553. nu. 212.* of one or two, as the [l] Iudgment of the whole Councill at *Chalcedon*. *Vigilius* uſed the very ſame fraud, and for this very cauſe, as the *Cardinall* confeſſeth, is reproved by the Councill. Seeing then, *Vigilius* did at this time, and in this cauſe, walke hand in hand, and ſtep by ſtep with the other followers of *Theodorus* and *Neſtorius*; The holy Councill judged it moſt fit and ſufficient (as it was indeed) to refuſe and condemne both him and his *Conſtitution*, by that common name which agreed to all the reſt, with whom in one common doctrine, both for his poſition and prooſes thereof, he fully conſpired.

3. The holy Councill hauing now fully diſcovered the error of the Popes *poſition*, and the fallacious proofe which he uſed to uphold the ſame, procedeth to refute his very *definitive* ſentence, prooving that neither the Epiſtle of *Ibas* is to be received as Catholike, neither that by it *Ibas* was, or ought to be judged a Catholike, which were the two maine points of the Popes *Decree* touching this *Chapter*. For declaring both theſe, they diligently examined the whole Epiſtle, and found it in every part to be *hereticall* and *blaſphemous*. But for the more cleare demonſtration hereof, as alſo how untruly and unjuſtly *Vigilius*, and the other followers of *Neſtorius* pretended, that it was received as *orthodoxall* by the Council at *Chalcedon*, they thought it not ſufficient to lay open the ſeverall impieties of that Epiſtle, conſidered by it ſelfe, but making a compariſon or *Collation* betwixt it and the holy Council at *Chalcedon*, they ſet, in a direct oppoſition, the moſt holy and Catholike truths decreed at *Chalcedon*, againſt the blaſphemous impieties and hereſies contained in that Epiſtle of *Ibas*. The ſumme of which Collations, or of ſome of them, I will here briefly propoſe out of the Synodall acts, referring the Reader for the full notice of them all, to the Acts themſelves, wherein they are at large, exactly, and excellently
n *Col. 6. pa. 575. & ſeq.* [n] delivered.

4. I. The holy Council of *Chalcedon* profeſſeth GOD to be incarnate, and made man: The Epiſtle calleth them *Heretickes* and *Apollinarians*, who ſay that GOD was incarnate or made Man.

II. The holy *Synod* profeſſeth the bleſſed *Virgin* to be the *Mother* of GOD: The Epiſtle denieth the *Virgin Mary* to be the *Mother* of GOD.

III. The holy Councill embraced that *forme of Faith* which was declared in the firſt *Epheſine Synod*, and anathematizeth *Neſtorius*: The Epiſtle defendeth *Neſtorius*, injureth, nay rejecteth,
o *Primam Epheſinam Synodum reprobat hæc Epiſtola. Col. 6. pa. 563. a. f.* [o] the holy *Epheſine* Councill, as if it had condemned *Neſtorius* without due triall of his cauſe.

IV. The holy Councill commendeth *Cyrill* of bleſſed memory, and approveth his Synodall Epiſtles, in one of which are conteined thoſe his 12. *Chapters* by which he condemned the

hereſie

hereſie of *Neſtorius*: The Epiſtle calleth *Cyrill* an *heretike*, and his 12. *Chapters* it tearmeth impious.

V. The Holy Councill profeſſeth their faith to be the ſame with *Cyrils*, and accurſeth thoſe who beleeve otherwiſe: The Epiſtle ſaith of *Cyrill*, & thoſe who beleeved as he did, that they were confounded, and recanted their former doctrine.

VI. The holy Councill accurſeth thoſe, who either make, or deliver any other *Creed*, then that which was expounded at the great *Nicen Syond*: The Epiſtle doth extoll *Theodorus*, who beſides innumerable blaſphemies, made another Creed, wherein he teacheth the *Word* of God to be one perſon, and *Chriſt* another perſon, accurſing all, who doe not embrace that his new *Creed*. This is that *Creed* of *Theodorus*, againſt which (being openly read before in the fourth *Collation*) the holy Councill exclamed, ſaying, p *the devill himſelfe compoſed this Creed: Curſed be he that compoſed this Creed: Curſed be all thoſe that curſe not the compoſer of this Creed.* Of this it is, that here they witnes, that the Epiſtle of *Ibas* praiſeth and magnifieth the author and compoſer thereof. p Pa. 536. a.

VII. The holy Councill teacheth, that in Chriſt there are *two diſtinct natures*, yet but one perſon conſiſting of both: The Epiſtle teacheth, that as there are two natures, ſo alſo *two perſons* in Chriſt, and that there is no perſonall, but onely an affectuall unitie of thoſe two perſons. Thus far hath the Synod opened, by way of compariſon, the blaſphemies of that Epiſtle, and the contrary truths decreed at *Chalcedon*.

5. Now although this *Collation* doth abundantly of it ſelfe manifeſt both the Impieties of that Epiſtle, of which *Vigilius* had decreed, that it ought to be received as *orthodoxall*: and how repugnant it is to the Councill of *Chalcedon*, of which *Vigilius* had decreed, that it was received as *orthodoxall*, by thoſe holy Fathers, yet for more evidence of this truth, the holy Councill doth in plaine and expreſſe tearmes, expreſſe both theſe points: for after this compariſon they ſaid, q *This our Collation, doth manifeſtly ſhew, quod contraria per omnia eſt Epiſtola definitioni*; *that this Epiſtle of Ibas is in all and every part thereof contrary to the definition of faith, which was made at Chalcedon*. And againe, *We all accurſe this Epiſtle, who ſo doth not accurſe this Epiſtle is an heretike*; *who ſo receiveth this Epiſtle is an heretike*: *who ſo receiveth this Epiſtle rejecteth the Councill of Chalcedon*: *who ſo receiveth this Epiſtle denieth God to be made man*. Thus ſaid, and cryed out the whole *Synod* with one voice: accurſing (as you plainly ſee) not onely the decree and definitive ſentence of *Vigilius* as *hereticall*, but *Vigilius* himſelfe as an *heretike*, as a rejecter of the Councill of *Chalcedon*, as a denier that God was incarnate, or made man. q Col. 6. pa. 576. a.

6. Thinke ye not that the Councill was very unmannerly, daring not onely to talke and write of this *Chapter*, contrary to the Popes knowne will and pleaſure, but even to condemne with one conſent his ſentence for *hereticall*, and himſelfe for an

heretike? Binius was exceeding loath to have it thought, that a generall, lawfull, ancient, and approved Councill, had ſo directly contradicted the Popes Cathedrall judgement, and proclamed to all the world the Pope to be an heretike, yea a definer of hereſie, and that by his *Apoſtolicall* authoritie; and therefore he not knowing any better way to ſave the Popes credit, thoght it moſt fit to ſuppreſſe and daſh out that whole paſſage in the Popes *Conſtitution*, which bewrayeth this matter: *Deleatur*, let all that part of the Conſtitution of *Vigilius* be left out; though the omiſſion thereof doth diſgrace and maime my edition of the Councils, let the latter part of his *Apoſtolicall* ſentence lye in obſcuritie and never ſee the Sunne.

7. *Baronius*, who (to the eternall infamy of their Popes, of their *infallible* Chaire, and of their whole religion, which wholly relies thereon) firſt had the heart to publiſh this Hereticall decree of *Vigilius*, deviſeth another medicine to ſalve this ſore: But avoiding Sylla he falleth into Charybdis, a worſe gulfe then the other, plunging himſelfe, with the Pope, in a condemned hereſie. There are (as he could not but confeſſe) [r] *many blaſphemies in that Epiſtle*, but *none of thoſe*, ſaith he, *did either the Councill of Chalcedon or Pope Vigilius approve.* What then, I pray you, was it, which his Holineſſe defended, and approved therein? Forſooth in the end [s] of the Epiſtle, *Ibas* declareth that he aſſented to the covenants of Vnion betweene *Iohn* and *Cyrill*, *qua recepta, neceſſe fuit eundem probare catholicum; which peace and union being embraced by Ibas, he muſt needes be acknowledged thereby to be a Catholike.* Seeing [t] then, this is underſtood, and gathered out of it, that after the Vnion, *Ibas* was a Catholike, we may ſee, *ob id non eſſe explodendam epiſtolam, ſed ad hoc quod dixi recipiendam, that for this cauſe the Epiſtle is not to be rejected, but to be received*, for this purpoſe, which I ſaid, that by the end of it *Ibas* may be proved to be a Catholike. And the *Cardinall* labours to prove this by two teſtimonies, the one is that of *Paſcaſinus*, and the other legates of *Leo*: They (ſaith he) [u] ſpake not amiſſe, when they ſaid, *Epiſtola illa lecta, Ibam probatum eſſe Catholicum*, that by that Epiſtle being read, *Ibas* was proved to be a Catholike: The other is that ſpeech of *Eunomius* B. of *Nichomedia*, of whom he thus writeth, [x] *Hoc plane fuit*, this is cleerly that which *Eunomius* ſaid, *ipſam Epiſtolam in principio apparere hæreticam, in fine vero inventam eſſe Catholicam; that the Epiſtle of Ibas by the beginning ſeemeth to be hereticall, but by the end was found to be Catholike.* Thus *Baronius*, in defence of that moſt impious Epiſtle, which as he ſaith, by the end of it is found to be *orthodoxall* and catholike, and ſo to be receeived.

r *Ann.* 553. *nu.* 191.

s *Ibid. nu.* 192.

t *Ibid. nu.* 197.

u *Ibid. nu.* 213.

x *Ibid.*

8. What is it to be an *heretike*, if this be not? Directly to contradict the judgement of an holy generall Councill, and defend that writing or part of it to be Catholike, which in every part the whole Councill hath defined to be *hereticall?* The whole Councill

Councill [y] with one voice proclamed; *Tota Epiſtola hæretica eſt; Tota Epiſtola blaſphema eſt, qui iſtam ſuſcipit, hæreticus eſt; The whole Epiſtle is heretical, and blaſphemous, who ſo receiveth this Epiſtle* (either in the whole, or in any part, as themſelves expreſſly affirme [z]) *he is an hereticke.*

[y] *Hæc omnes dicimus, &c. Col. 6. pa. 576. b.*

[z] *Qui dicunt eam rectam eſſe vel partem ejus. Col. 8. pa. 587. b.*

Not ſo, ſaith the *Card.* It is not all hereticall, It is not all blaſphemous: The latter part of it, is right, holy, and Catholike, by it *Ibas* was rightly judged to be a Catholike; That part, at leaſt, is to be received and embraced, to declare *Ibas* to be a Catholike. Now though this alone were enough to refute whatſoever the *Cardinall* doth or can ſay in this cauſe, ſeeing it is all nothing elſe, but the ſaying, nay the cavilling of a convicted heretike, proclamed for ſuch by the loud cryes of an ancient and holy generall Councill, yet for the full manifeſting of the truth, I will doe the *Cardinall* that favour, as to examine both his aſſertion, and the proofes thereof. And becauſe I ſhall hereafter in due place have fit occaſion at large (as the obſcuritie and intricacy of this cauſe requireth) to diſcuſſe the words and declare the true meaning of *Ibas* in that part, which the *Cardinall* doth moſt wilfully and heretically miſtake and pervert, for this time, I will uſe no other proofe againſt him, but the cleere judgement and conſenting teſtimony of the generall Councill, which hath profeſſedly refuted this very cavil, which *Baronius* borrowed from the ancient heretikes of thoſe times. And I am verily perſwaded, that *Baronius* would never, for very ſhame of the world, have uſed this ſo untrue, ſo *hereticall*, and withall a rejected evaſion, but that he hoped that none would compare and examine his writings by the Acts of the Councils, or if they did, that the fame and credit of Cardinall *Baronius* his name would countenance any untruth or Hereſie againſt whatſoever opponents.

9. Is the end of the Epiſtle of *Ibas* Catholike? or doth that ſhew *Ibas* to bee a Catholike? The whole Councill expreſſly witneſſeth the contrary. *Our* [a] *Collation* (ſay they) *doth manifeſtly ſhew that this Epiſtle of Ibas, contraria per omnia eſt Definitioni; is in every part of it contrary to the Definition of faith made at Chalcedon.* This whole Epiſtle is hereticall, and blaſphemous. Againe, Wee have demonſtrated (ſay they) [b] this Epiſtle, *contrariam eſſe per omnia; To be in every part of it contrary to thoſe things which are contained in the Definition of faith made at Chalcedon.* Againe, [c] *Tota epiſtola impietatis plena eſt, the whole Epiſtle is full of impietie.* And more clearly to our purpoſe, and againſt this cavill of *Baronius*, they adde, *Thoſe* [d] *who ſay that the former part of this Epiſtle is impious, but the latter part or end thereof is right, Calumniatores demonſtrantur, ſuch are demonſtrated to be Calumniators* or Slanderers, *Poſteriora enim inſerta Epiſtolæ majori impietate plena ſunt*, for thoſe things which are ſet downe in the latter part or end of that Epiſtle, are more full of greater impietie, injuring *Cyrill*, and defending the impious hereſie.

[a] *Col. 6. pa. 575. a.*

[b] *Col. 8. pa. 5.*

[c] *Col. 6. pa. 564. a.*

[d] *Ibid.*

hereſie of *Neſtorius*. So by the judgement of the whole Councel *Baronius* is not onely proved, but even demonſtrated to be an *Heretike*, and a malicious *Caviller*, for his defending the latter part of this Epiſtle to be right and catholike. And this is al which he hath gained by renewing that old hereticall and rejected cavill for defence of *Vigilius*.

10. But what ſhall we then ſay to the proofes of *Baronius*? what firſt, to the *Interlocution* of the Popes Legates ſo often and with oſtentation mentioned by the *Cardinall*? What? Truly the very ſame which the holy generall Councill hath ſaid before us, and taught, and warranted all others to ſay the ſame. The holy Fathers at *Chalcedon* (ſay they) did theſe things, *pro*[e] *nihilo habentes ea quæ ab uno vel duobus pro eadem Epiſtola dicta ſunt*; *eſteeming worth nothing at all, thoſe things which were ſpoken by one or two for that Epiſtle*. Thus teſtifieth the whole Synod, and themſelves follow herein the judgement of the Fathers at *Chalcedon*: So by the judgement of two holy and generall Councils, that *Interlocution* of the Legates of Pope *Leo*, on which (after) *Vigilius* and *Baronius* relyeth, is worth nothing at all.

e Col. 6. p. 576. a.

11. Yea, but *Eunomius*, as *Baronius* tells us, affirmeth, that though the beginning of the Epiſtle be hereticall, yet the end of it is found to be Catholike. *Baronius* indeed ſaith ſo of *Eunomius*; but what truth and honeſt dealing there is in *Baronius*, let the diſcreet Reader judge by this one ſaying among ten thouſand the like; *Eunomius* ſaith not ſo, *Eunomius* ſaith the flat contrary, as in the fift Councill is clearly witneſſed; where againſt this cavill of the old heretikes, whom *Baronius* followeth, they ſay[f] thus, *Nullam partem epiſtolæ apparet Eunomium comprobaſſe*; *it's evident that Eunomius approved no part at all of this Epiſtle*. And againe, *Quomodo*[g] *præſumunt iſti defenſores calumniari interlocutionem Eunomij: how dare the defenders of this Epiſtle preſume to ſlaunder the Interlocution of Eunomius*, as condemning one part of it, and approving another, ſeeing the whole epiſtle is full of impiety? I ſay yet more (which will manifeſt the Councils doome of *Baronius*, that he is a malicious caviller, to be moſt juſt) *Eunomius* ſpeakes not either of the beginning or end of that Epiſtle in his *Interlocution*, but *Baronius*, according to his wont, foiſts in that clauſe (touching the end of the Epiſtle) out of his owne pate, and thereby falſifieth both the words and meaning of *Eunomius*. This in the Councill is evidently declared by reciting the true words of *Eunomius* out of the Acts[h] at *Chalcedon*: which are theſe; *Ex recitatis*,[i] *By thoſe things which have beene read and recited*, Ibas is ſhewed to be innocent: for wherein he ſeemed to be blame-worthy in accuſing *Cyrill*, *in poſterioribus*, or in *poſtremis*, *rectè confeſſus*, *having afterwards*, *or at the laſt*, *made a true confeſſion*, he hath refuted that wherein he was blamed: wherefore I alſo judge him worthy of his Biſhoprike if, he accurſe *Neſtorius*, *Eutyches*, and their wicked hereſies, and conſent to the writings

f Col. 6. pa. 564. a.

g Ibid.

h Act. 10. p. 116. a

i Con. 5. Col. 6. pa. 564. a.

writings of *Leo*, and this generall Councill. Thus ſaid *Eunomius:* wherein there is neither mention nor intention of that Epiſtle, neither of the firſt, middle, nor laſt part thereof. But whereas in the Councill of *Chalcedon*, many other [k] things, beſides that Epiſtle, were recited touching the cauſe of *Ibas*, and particularly the whole *Acts* before *Photius*, *Euſtathius*, and *Vranius* B. of Berithum, where a Synod was held about *Ibas*; it was thoſe Acts and judgement given by them, and performed by *Ibas*, (and not the Epiſtle of *Ibas*) to which *Eunomius* had reſpect, when he ſaid, by the *poſteriora*, or *poſtrema*, *Ibas* made a true confeſſion, for ſo in the fifth Council it is cleerly witneſſed: *It is manifeſt* (ſay they) *that* [l] *Eunomius made this ſpeech, geſta apud Photium, et Euſtathium attendens, looking at thoſe Acts before Photius and Euſtathius.* Now in thoſe Acts, as is manifeſt by the diligent peruſall thereof, and is further teſtified by the fift Councill, [m] there was a judgement pronounced by *Photius* and *Euſtathius*, *adverſus eam epiſtolam et quæ in ea continentur*; *againſt that Epiſtle, and the contents thereof:* *Ibas* being commanded by thoſe venerable Iudges, both to embrace the firſt *Epheſine* Synod, which that impious Epiſtle rejecteth, and to condemne and accurſe *Neſtorius* and his followers, whom that Epiſtle commendeth: which judgement that *Ibas* then performed, the *Acts* before *Photius* and *Euſtathius* doe make evident: for there it is thus ſaid, [n] *Confeſſus eſt Ibas ſic ſe credere? Ibas profeſſed that he beleeved as the letters of Cyrill to Iohn did import*, and that he conſented in all things to the *firſt* Synod at *Epheſus*, accounting their judgement as a decree inſpired by the holy Ghoſt. Yea he did not onely in words profeſſe this, but in [o] writing alſo, (at the perſwaſions of *Photius* and *Euſtathius*) he expreſſed the like for the full ſatisfaction of ſuch as had been before ſcandalized by his impious doctrine. And *Ibas yet further of his* [p] *owne accord promiſed before thoſe Iudges, that he would in his own Church at Edeſſa, and that publikely accurſe Neſtorius as the chief leader in that impious hereſie, and thoſe alſo who did thinke as he did, or who did uſe his books or writings.* Thus much do thoſe Acts declare.

12. This *orthodoxall confeſſion* of *Ibas*, made before *Photius* and *Euſtathius*, this accurſing of *Neſtorius* and his hereſies, this embracing of the Epheſine Councill, is that, which *Eunomius* calleth *Poſteriora*, or *Poſtrema*, as following by many yeares, not onely that which *Ibas* did or ſaid before the Vnion made betweene *Iohn* and *Cyrill*, but even this *Impious Epiſtle* alſo written after that Vnion. Of this confeſſion *Eunomius* truly ſaid, that by it (being *poſterius*, later then the Epiſtle) *Ibas* had refuted all for which he was formerly blamed: for by this, in effect, he refuted, condemned, and accurſed this whole Epiſtle with all the hereſies and blaſphemies, both in the head and taile thereof. And for this cauſe, and in regard of this holy confeſſion, the fift Councill ſaid, that thereby *Ibas* [q] *had anathematized his owne Epiſtle, contrariam per omnia, being in every part of it contrary*

k *Act. 9. & 10.*

l *Col. 6. pa. 564. a.*

m *Ibid. pa. 563. & ſeq.*

n *Apud Conc. Chal. act. 9. pa. 108. a.*

o *Præparavimus Ibam, quod & amplexus eſt, ex ſcripto dare quid ſentit de pia fide noſtra. ibid. 107. b.*

p *Ex abundanti anuit promiſit, &c. ib.*

q *Oſtenditur inde quod anathematizavit Epiſtolam &c Col. 6. pa. 564. a.*

trary to the faith, both in the beginning and end thereof. And the *interlocution* of *Euſebius* B. of Ancyra, at the Councill of Chalcedon, doth fully explaine the meaning of *Eunomius*; for he expreſly mentioneth thoſe *Acts* before *Photius* and *Euſtathius*, and the confeſſion of *Ibas* then made (which *Eunomius* called *poſteriora*) *ſaying thus*, [r] *The reading of that judgement before Photius and Euſtathius, doth teach that Ibas, in that judgement, accurſed Neſtorius and his impious doctrines, and conſented to the true faith: Wherfore I receive him for a Biſhop, if he now doe condemne Neſtorius.* The like ſaid [s] *Diogenes* B. of *Cyzicum*, *Thalaſſius Biſhop of Ceſarea*, *Iohn Biſhop of Sebaſtia*, and they all cryed, *Omnes eadem dicimus, wee all ſay the ſame.* So cleare it is that upon this holy *Confeſſion* of *Ibas* made firſt before *Photius* and *Euſtathius*, and after that, before all the Councill at *Chalcedon*, and not upon this Epiſtle, nor any part, firſt or laſt thereof, *Ibas* was acknowledged and embraced for a Catholike, both by *Eunomius*, *Euſebius*, *Diogenes*, and all the whole Councill of *Chalcedon*.

r *Act.* 10. *Concil. Chal. pa.* 115 *b.*

s *Ibid.*

13. By this now appeareth not onely the error, but the extreme fraud of *Baronius*, who in excuſe of *Vigilius*, not onely affirmeth an hereticall untruth, that the latter part of the Epiſtle is *orthodoxall*, but labours to uphold and boulſter out that untruth with a malitious perverting and falſifying both of the words and meaning of *Eunomius*. And thus far proceeded the holy Councill againſt *Vigilius* in their *ſixt Seſſion*, being the very next after they had received the Popes mandatorie letters, commanding them neither to ſpeake nor write ought concerning the *Three Chapters*, otherwiſe then he by his *Apoſtolicall* conſtitution had decreed.

14. In the ſeventh *Collation*, beſides the publike reading of divers letters and writings for the manifeſtation of the truth, and of the uprightnes of their judgment in this cauſe of the *three Chapters*; all that was formerly done, was now againe [t] repeated and approved by the holy Councill. Such diligence and warineſſe they uſed in this matter, that nothing might paſſe without often recitall and ſerious ponderation by the whole Councill.

t *Quæ jam acta ſunt, relegantur: & relecta ſunt. Col.* 7. *pa.* 577. *b.*

15. In the eight, which is the laſt *Collation*, the holy Councill proceeded to their *Synodall*, and *Definitive* ſentence, touching all thoſe *Three Chapters*, which *Vigilius* (as they knew) by his decree and Apoſtolicall authoritie had defended. But the Councill directly contradicting the Pope in them all, doth *Definitively* condemne and accurſe them all, and all who defend them or any of them: which ſentence of the Councill, as *Baronius* truly confeſſeth [v], was pronounced *contra decreta ipſius* (*Vigilij*) *in a direct oppoſition to the Decrees of Vigilius*. Which that it may fully appeare, as you have before ſeene the words of the Popes *Decree*, ſo now conſider alſo, and compare with them, the words and *Decree* of the Councill.

v *An.* 553. *nu.* 219.

16. Firſt,

16. Firſt the holy Councill ſets downe in generall their ſentence concerning all the *Three Chapters*, (The defenders of which they had before [x], and here [y] againe doe proclame to be heretikes) in this manner; We [z] accurſe the *Three* foreſaid *Chapters*, to wit, *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia*, with his impious writings, The impious writings of *Theodoret* againſt *Cyril*, and the impious Epiſtle of *Ibas*, *et defenſores eorum*, *et qui ſcripſerunt*, *vel ſcribunt ad defenſionem eorum*; *alſo we accurſe the Defenders of thoſe Chapters, and thoſe who have written, or who do (at any time) write for the defence of them*, or who preſume to ſay that they are right, or who have defended, *aut defendere conantur*, or who doe (at any time) indevour to defend their impietie under the name of the holy Fathers, or of the Councill at *Chalcedon*. Thus decreed the whole Synod. Now Pope *Vigilius*, as you have ſeene before, defended all theſe *Three Chapters*, he defended them by writing, yea by his *Apoſtolicall* authoritie, *Conſtitution*, and *Definitive* ſentence: he defended them by the name of the holy Fathers, and of the Councill at *Chalcedon*; Pope *Vigilius* then, by the judiciall and definitive ſentence of this holy generall Councill is an *Anathema*, a condemned and accurſed heretike; yea a Definer of a condemned and accurſed hereſie. *Baronius* writeth earneſtly in defence of Pope *Vigilius* and his *Conſtitution*, he commends him for defending thoſe *Three Chapters*, ſaying, [a] *The Defenders of them were praiſed while they had Pope Vigilius, whom they might follow:* and *Vigilius* himſelfe he had [b] many and worthy reaſons to make his *Conſtitution* in defence of thoſe *Chapters*: he further preſumes to defend *Vigilius* under the name and ſhew of conſenting with the holy Fathers and Councill at *Chalcedon*. *Card. Baronius* then by the ſame definitive ſentence of this holy and generall Councill, is an *Anathema* with *Vigilius*, a condemned and accurſed heretike.

x *Qui hanc (Epiſtolam) non anathematizat, hæreticus eſt.* Col 6. pa. 576. b.
y *Hæreticorum condemnationem.* Col. 8 pa. 586. b.
z Ibid. pa. 586. a,
a *An.* 546. *nu.* 40.
b *An.* 553. *nu.* 233.

17. After this generall ſentence, the Councill proceedeth, in particular & ſeverally, to condemne each of theſe *Three Chapters* by it ſelfe. Of the firſt they thus define. [c] *If any do defend impious Theodorus of Mopſveſtia, et non anathematizat eum, and doe not accurſe him and his impious writings, let ſuch an one be accurſed.* Now Pope *Vigilius* (as you have ſeene) would not himſelfe, neither would he permit any other to accurſe this *Theodorus*, he forbiddeth any to doe it, he made an *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution* that none ſhould accurſe him: *Card. Baronius* he writeth in defence of *Vigilius* and of his *Conſtitution* in this point: *Thomas Stapleton* goeth further, for he is ſo far from accurſing this *Theodorus*, that he expreſly calls [d] him a Catholike, yea a moſt Catholike Biſhop: *Vigilius* then, *Baronius* and *Stapleton* are al of them accurſed by the Definitive ſentence of this holy generall Councill, in this firſt Chapter.

c Col. 8. pa. 587. b.
d Conterbl. diviſ. 68. pa. 171.

18. Of the ſecond *Chapter* they [e] thus decree. If any defend the writings of *Theodoret* againſt *Cyril*, *et non anathematizat ea*, and

e Col. 8.

and doe not accurſe them, let him be an Anathema. Vigilius would not himſelfe accurſe them, he would not permit any other to diſgrace *Theodoret*, or injure him by accurſing his writings: *Baronius* defendeth and commendeth this decree of *Vigilius*; they both then are tyed againe in this third *Anathema* of the Councill.

19. Though a threefold cord be not eaſily broken, yet the holy Councill addeth a fourth, which is more indiſſoluble then any adamantine chaine. Of the *Third Chapter* they decree in this manner; [f] If any defend that impious Epiſtle of *Ibas* unto *Maris*, which denieth God to be borne of the bleſſed Virgin, which accuſeth *Cyrill* for an heretike, which condemneth the holy Councill of *Epheſus*, and defendeth *Theodorus* and *Neſtorius*, with their impious doctrines and writings, if any defend this Epiſtle, *et non anathematizat eam, et defenſores ejus, et eos qui dicunt eam rectam eſſe, vel partem ejus, et eos qui ſcripſerunt et ſcribunt pro eâ; If any doe not accurſe this Epiſtle, and the Defenders of it, and thoſe who ſay that it, or any part of it, is right; If any do not alſo accurſe thoſe who have written, or who (at any time) doe write for it, and the impiety contained in it, and who preſume to defend it by the name of the holy Fathers, or of the Councill at Chalcedon, ſuch an one be accurſed.* Now *Vigilius* (as was formerly declared) defendeth this Epiſtle, as orthodoxall, he defendeth it by his *Cathedrall* ſentence and Apoſtolicall authoritie, he defendeth it under the name of the holy Fathers, and of the Councill at *Chalcedon*; ſaying, [g] *Orthodoxa eſt Ibæ à patribus pronũciata dictatio*; *Baronius* defendeth both *Vigilius* and this Epiſtle in ſome part thereof, he defendeth them under pretence of the Fathers and Councill at *Chalcedon*, ſaying, [h] *Patres dixerunt, eam Epiſtolam ut Catholicam recipiendam*; *The Fathers at Chalcedon ſaid, that this Epiſtle ought to be received as orthodoxall:* Is it poſſible thinke you, by any ſhift or evaſion, to free either *Vigilius* or *Baronius* from this fourth *Anathema* denounced by the judiciall and Definitive ſentence of this Holy Generall Councill.

f *Conſt. loc. cit. nu. 192.*

g *An. 553. nu. 191*

20. But what ſpeake I of *Baronius*, as if he alone were a Defender of *Vigilius* and his *Conſtitution?* All who have, or who at any time doe hold, and defend, either by word or writing, that the Popes judiciall and definitive ſentence, in cauſes of faith, is infallible (and this is held, by *Bellarmine, Gretzer, Pighius, Gregorius de Valentia*, and, as afterwards I purpoſe to declare at large, by all [i] and every one, who is truly a member of the preſent Romane Church) all theſe by holding and defending this one Poſition, doe implicitly in that, hold and defend every *Cathedrall* and definitive ſentence of any of their Popes, and particularly this *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution* of Pope *Vigilius*, to be not only true, but infallible alſo: and ſo they all defend the *Three Chapters*; they defend the Defenders of them, by name Pope *Vigilius* among the reſt. All theſe then are unavoidably included within all the former

i *Vt nemo Catholicum eſſe poſſit, qui illã non amplectatur Greg. de Val. in 2. 2 diſp. 1. par. 1. pa. 30*

former Anathemaes all denounced and proclamed to be heretikes, to be accurſed and ſeparate from God, by the judiciall and definitive ſentence of this holy generall Councill.

21. With what comfort, alacritie and confidence may the ſervants of Chriſt fight his battles, and defend their holy faith and religion? or how can the ſervants of *Antichriſt* chuſe, but be utterly diſmayed and daunted herewith, ſeeing they cannot wag their tongues or hands, to ſpeake or write ought either againſt ours, or in defence of their owne doctrines, eſpecially not of that which is the foundation of the reſt, and is virtually in them all, but *ipſo facto*, even for that act alone, if there were no other cauſe, they are declared and pronounced by the judiciall ſentence of an holy, generall, and approved Councill, to be accurſed heretikes.

22. The Councill yet adds another clauſe, which juſtly chalengeth a ſpeciall conſideration. Some there are who would be held men of ſuch a milde and mercifull diſpoſition, that though they diſlike and condemne thoſe aſſertions of the Popes ſupremacy of authoritie, and infallibility of judgement, yet are they ſo charitably affected to the Defenders of thoſe aſſertions, that they dare not themſelves, nor can indure that others ſhould call them heretickes or accurſed: *Durus eſt hic ſermo*, this is too harſh and hard. See here the fervour and zeale of this holy Councill! They firſt ſay, Curſed be the defenders of this Epiſtle or any part thereof: As much in effect, as if they had ſaid, Curſed be *Vigilius*, *Baronius*, *Bellarmine*, and all who defend the Popes judgement in cauſes of faith to be infallible, that is, all that are members of the preſent Church of Rome, Curſed be they all. And not contenting themſelves herewith, they adde, Curſed be he who doth not accurſe the defenders of that Epiſtle or of any part thereof: As much in effect, as if they had ſaid, Curſed be every one who doth not accurſe *Vigilius*, *Baronius*, *Bellarmine*, and all that defend the Popes judgement in cauſes of faith to be infallible, that is, all that are members of the preſent Romane Church, Curſed be he who doth not accurſe them all. The holy Councill no doubt had an eye [k] to the words of the Prophet Ieremy, [l] *Curſed be he that doth the worke of the Lord negligently, Curſed be he that keepeth back his ſword from blood.* To ſpare when God commands, and whom he commands to curſe or kill, is neither pitty nor piety, but meere rebellion againſt the Lord, and pulls downe that judgement which God himſelfe threatned [m] to *Ahab*, Becauſe thou haſt let goe out of thine hand, a man whom I appointed to dye, thy life ſhall goe for his life.

k *Nos timentes maledictionem, quæ imminet his qui negligenter opera Domini faciunt*, Col. 8. pa. 584. a.

l Ier. 48. 10.

m 1 King. 20. 42.

23. What then? is there no meanes, no hope of ſuch that they may be ſaved? God forbid. Far be it from my heart once to thinke, or my tongue to utter ſo hard a ſentence. There is a meanes, and that after the Scripture, the Councill expreſly and often

often sets downe, even were they denounce all those Anathemaes, for thus they say, [n] They who defend *Theodorus*, the writings of *Theodoret* against *Cyrill*, the impious Epistle of *Ibas*, or the defenders of them, *et in his vsq; ad mortem permanent, and continue in this defence, untill they dye*, let such be accursed. Renounce the defence of these *Chapters*, and of the Defenders of them, that is, forsake and renounce that position of the Popes Cathedrall infallibility in defining causes of faith: renounce the defence of all that defend it, that is, of the whole present Romane Church; *Come* [o] *out of Babylon the habitation of devils, the hold of all vncleane spirits, which hath made all nations drunke with the wine of her fornication*, which themselves [p] cannot but acknowledge to be meant of Rome: This doe, and then, *Come* [q] *unto the Lord and he will have mercy, and to our God, for he is very ready to forgive*: All your former impieties, heresies, and blasphemies shall not be mentioned unto you, but in the righteousnes and Catholike truths which ye then embrace, you shall live. If this they will not doe, we accuse them not, we accurse them not: they have one who doth both accuse and accurse them, even this holy general Council, whose just Anathemaes shal as firmely binde them before God in heaven, as they were truly denounced by the Synod here on earth, for he hath sealed theirs and all like censures with his owne signet, who [r] said, Whatsoever ye binde upon earth, shall be bound in heaven.

24. After all these just Anathemaes denounced as well in generall as in particular by the Councill against the defenders of these *Three Chapters* or any one of them; the holy Synod sets downe in the last place one other point as memorable as any of the former: And that is by what authority they decreed all these things, of which they thus say, [s] we have rightly confessed these things, *quæ tradita sunt nobis tam à divinis scripturis; which are delivered unto us both in the divine scriptures, and in the doctrines of the holy Fathers, and in the definitions of faith made by the foure former Councils*. So the holy Councill. Whence it doth evidently ensue, that to teach and affirme, that the Pope in his judiciall and cathedrall sentence of faith may erre and define heresie, and that *Vigilius* in his constitution *de facto* did so, is a truth consorant to Scriptures, fathers, and the foure first general Councils. But on the other side, to maintaine or affirme (as do all who are members of the present Romane Church) that the Popes cathedrall sentence in causes of faith is *infallible*, is an hereticall position repugnant to Scriptures, Fathers, and the 4. first Councils, and condemned by them all. So at once the Holy Councill judicially defineth both our faith to be truly ancient & Apostolical, the selfe same which the Holy Fathers, generall Councills, and the Catholike Church professed for 600 yeares; and the doctrine of the present Romane Church, even that fundamentall position, on which all the rest doe relye, to be not onely new, but

n *Col. 8. sepe.*

o *Apoc. 18. 2. 3. 4.*

p *Iohannes in Apocalypsi passim Romã vocat Babylonem. Bell. lib. 2. de pont. Rom. cap. 2. § Præterea. Babylon quæ casura prædicitur, Roma quidem est. Ribera in ca. 14. in. Apoc. pa. 377. Et, Roma quali in fine sæculi futura est. Ib. pa. 378. Iohannes loquitur de Roma quali sub finẽ mundi futura est Gretz. Def. ca. 13. lib. 3. de Rom. pont. pa. 927. Babylon, quam esse Romam ait lib 7 pa. 228. sedes et civitas antichristi est. Sand. lib. 8. de visib. Monar. ca. 48.*

q *Isa. 55. 7.*

r *Matth. 18, 18.*

s *Col. 8. pa. 588. a.*

but hereticall, ſuch as none can maintaine, but even thereby he oppugneth and contradicteth both the Scriptures, Fathers, the foure firſt general Councils, and the Catholike Church for 600 yeares after Chriſt.

25. Further yet: becauſe one part of their ſentence is the accurſing of all who defend the *Three Chapters*, either expreſly, as did *Vigilius*, or *implicitè*, and by conſequent, as do all who maintaine the Popes judgement in cauſes of faith to be infallible, that is, al who are members of the preſent Romane Church, and ſo die; it cleerely enſueth from that laſt clauſe of the Councill, that to condemne and accurſe as heretikes all theſe, yea, all which doe not accurſe theſe, is by the judgement of this whole generall Council, warranted by Scriptures, by Fathers, by the foure firſt generall Councils, and by the Caholike Church for 600 yeares after Chriſt: The judgement of this fifth Council being conſonant to them all, and warranted by them all.

26. Neither is their *Decree* conſonant onely to precedent Fathers, and Councils, but approved and confirmed by ſucceeding generall Councils, by Popes, and other Biſhops, in the following ages of the Church. By the ſixt Councill, which profeſſeth [t] of it ſelfe that *in omnibus conſonuit; it in all points agreeth with the fifth.* By the ſecond *Nicene*, (which they account for the ſeaventh) *which reckneth* [u] *this fift, for one of the golden Councils, which are glorious by the words of the holy Spirit, and which all being inlightned by the ſame ſpirit, decreed thoſe things which are profitable:* profeſſing that themſelves did condemne all whom thoſe Councils (and among them whom this fift) did condemne. By other following Councils, in every one of which the 2 *Nicene* (and by conſequent this fift) Councill is approved, as by the acts is cleare: and *Baronius* confeſſeth [x] that this fift, *in alijs Oecumenicis Synodis poſtea celebratis cognita eſt atq; probata, was acknowledged and approved by the other generall Councils which were held after it.*

t *Act. 15. pa. 80. a.*

u *Act. 6. pa. 357. a*

x *An. 553. nu. 219*

27. It was likewiſe approved by ſucceeding Popes and Biſhops. By *Pelagius* the ſecond, who writ an whole Epiſtle [y] to perſwade the Biſhops of *Iſtria* to condemne the *Three Chapters*, telling [z] *them that though Pope Vigilius reſiſted the condemnation of them, yet others his predeceſſours which followed Vigilius did conſent thereunto.* By Gregory, *who profeſſing* [a] *to embrace & reverence the 4 firſt Councils, as the 4 Euangeliſts, addeth of this fift, Quintũ quoq; cõcilium pariter veneror; I do in like manner reverence the fift Councill,* wherin the impious Epiſtle of *Ibas* is rejected, & the writings of *Theodoret*, with *Theodorus* & his writings. And then of them all he ſaith, *Cunctas perſonas, whatſoever perſons the foreſaid (five) venerable Councils doe condemne, thoſe alſo doe I condemne, whom they reverence I embrace; becauſe ſeeing they are decreed by an univerſall conſent, whoſoever preſumeth to looſe, whom they bind, or bind whom they looſe, ſe et non illa deſtruit, he deſtroyeth himſelfe, but not thoſe Councils, and whoſoever thinketh otherwiſe, let him be accurſed.* Thus

y *Epiſt. 7. Pelag. 2.*

z *Pa. 687.*

a *Lib. 1. Epiſt. 24.*

Pope *Gregory* the great, ratifying all the former *anathemaes* of the Councill, and accurſing all that labour to unty thoſe bands. By *Agatho*[b], by *Leo*[c] the ſecond, who both call this an holy Synod; and, not to ſtay in particulars, All[d] their Popes (after the the time of *Gregorie*) were accuſtomed at their election to make profeſſion of this fift, as of the former Councils, and that in ſuch ſolemne and exact manner, after the time of *Hadrian* the ſecond, that they profeſſed (as their forme it ſelfe ſet downe by *Anton. Auguſtinus*[e] doth witneſſe) to embrace the eight generall Councils, (whereof this was one) to hold them *pari honore et veneratione, in equal honor and eſteeme*, to keepe them intirely *uſq; ad unum apicem, to the leaſt iôta*, to follow and teach whatſoever they decreed, and whatſoever they condemned to condemne both with their mouth and heart. A like forme of profeſſion is ſet downe in the Councill at *Conſtance*[f], where the Councill having firſt decreed[g] the power and authoritie of the Pope to be inferiour and ſubject to the Councill, and that he ought to be obedient to them both, in matters of faith and orders of reformation, by this their ſuperior authoritie ordaineth, *That every Pope at the time of his election ſhall profeſſe that, corde et ore, both in words and in his heart hee doth embrace and firmely beleeve the doctrines delivered by the holy Fathers, and by the eleven generall Councils (this fift being reckned for one) and that he will keepe, defend and teach the ſame faith with them, uſq; ad unum apicem, even to the leaſt ſyllable.* To goe no further, *Baronius* confeſſeth[h], that not onely *Gregory* and his predeceſſors (unto *Vigilius*) *ſed ſucceſſores omnes, but all the ſucceſſors of Gregory* are knowne to have received and confirmed this fift Councill.

28. Neither onely did the Popes approve it, but all orthodoxal Biſhops in the world: it being a cuſtome, as *Baronius* ſheweth[i], that they did profeſſe to embrace the ſeven generall Councills, which forme of faith *Orthodoxi omnes ex more profiteri deberent, all orthodoxall Biſhops by cuſtome were bound to profeſſe.* And this, as it ſeemeth, they did in thoſe *Literæ Formatæ, or Communicatoriæ*, or *Pacificæ*, (ſo they were called[k]) which from ancient time they uſed to give and receive. For by that forme of letters they teſtified their communion in faith, and peaceable agreemẽt with the whole Catholike Church. Such an Vniforme conſent there was in approving this fift Council in all ſucceeding Councills, Popes and Biſhops, almoſt to theſe dayes.

29. From whence it evidently and unavoidably enſueth, that as this fift Synod, ſo all ſucceeding Councils, Popes and Biſhops, to the time of the Councill of *Conſtance*[l], that is, for more then fourteene hundred yeares together after Chriſt, doe all with this fift Councill condemne and accurſe, as *hereticall*, the judiciall and definitive ſentence of Pope *Vigilius*, delivered by his *Apoſtolical* authority, for inſtruction of the whole Church in this cauſe of faith: & therfore they al with an uniforme conſent did in heart

b *In Conc. 6. Act. 4. pa. 16. a.*
c *Epiſt. ad Conſtan. Imp.*
d *Bar. an. 869. nu. 58, 59.*
e *In manuſcripto codice ex quo eum citat Bar. loco citato*
f *Seſ. 39. pa. 1644.*
g *Seſ. 4. pa. 1560.*
h *An. 553. nu. 229*
i *An. 869. nu. 58.*
k *Cum quo totus orbis commercio formatarum, concordat. Opt. lib. 2. p. 40. Quærebam utrum epiſtolas communicatorias quas Formatas dicimus, poſſent quo vellent dare. Aug. Epiſt. 163. Sub probatione Epiſtoly, ſive Pacificis, quæ dicuntur Eccleſiaſtica. Conc. Chalc. can. 11.*
l *Celebratum eſt an. 1414.*

heart beleeve, and in words profeſſe and teach, that the Popes Cathedrall ſentence in cauſes of faith, may be, and *de facto* hath been hereticall: that is, they all did beleeve and teach, that doctrine which the reformed Churches maintaine, to be truly ancient, orthodoxall and catholike, ſuch as the whole Church of Chriſt, for more then 14 hundred yeares, beleeved and taught: but the doctrine (even the Fundamentall poſition whereon all their doctrines doe relie, and which is vertually included in them all) which the preſent Church of Rome maintaineth, to be new, hereticall and accurſed, ſuch as the whole Church for ſo many hundred yeares together with one conſent beleeved and taught to be accurſed and hereticall. It hence further enſueth, that as this fift Councill did, ſo all the fore-mentioned generall Councils, Popes and Biſhops, doe with it condemne and accurſe for heretikes not onely *Vigilius*, but all who either have or doe hereafter defend him and his *Conſtitution*, even all, who either by word or writing, have or ſhall maintaine that the Popes *Cathedrall* judgement in cauſes of faith is infallible, that is, all who are members of the preſent Romane Church, and ſo continue till their death: nay, they not onely accurſe all ſuch, but further alſo, even all who doe not accurſe ſuch. And becauſe the decree of this fift Councill is approved by them, to the leaſt *iôta*, it in the laſt place followeth, that the condemning and accurſing for hereticall that doctrine of the Popes infallibilitie in cauſes of faith, and accurſing for heretikes, all who either by word or writing have, or doe at any time hereafter defend the ſame, and ſo preſiſt till they dye; nay, not onely the accurſing of all ſuch, but of all who doe not accurſe them, is warranted by Scriptures, by Fathers, by all generall Councils, by all Popes and Biſhops, that have beene for more then 14. hundred yeares after Chriſt.

30. This Vniforme conſent continued in the Church untill the time of *Leo* the 10 and his *Laterane* Councill. Till then, neither was the Popes authoritie held for ſupreme, nor his judiciall ſentence in cauſes of faith held for infallible: nay, to hold theſe was judged and defined to be hereticall, and the maintainers of them to be heretikes. For beſides that they all till that time approved this fift Councill, wherein theſe truths were decreed, the ſame was expreſly decreed by two generall Councils, the one at *Conſtance*, the other at *Baſil*, not long before [m] that *Laterane* Synod. In both which it was defined, *that not the Popes ſentence, but the Iudgement of a generall Councill,* [n] *is, ſupremum in terris; the higheſt judgement in earth, for rooting out of errors, and preſerving the true faith, unto which judgement every one, even the Pope* [o] *himſelfe, is ſubject, and ought to obey it, or if he will not, is puniſhable* [p] *by the ſame.* Conſider beſide many other that one teſtimony of the Councill of *Baſil*, and you ſhall ſee they beleeved and profeſſed this as a Catholike truth, which in all ages

m *Conc. Baſil. finitum eſt an. 1442. id eſt, an. 74. ante concil. Later.*

n *Concil. Baſil. in Decreto quinq. concluſ. pa. 96. a.*

o *Cui quilibet etiamſi papalis ſtatus exiſtat, obedire tenetur. Conc. Conſtant. ſeſſ. 4. & Baſ. ſeſſ. 2.*

p *Debite puniatur. Conc. Conſt. ſeſſ. 5. et Baſil. ſeſſ. 3.*

of the Church had beene, and ſtill ought to be embraced. They having recited that Decree of the Councill at *Conſtance*, for the ſupreme authority of a Councill, to which the Pope is ſubject, ſay [q] thus, *Licet has eſſe veritates fidei catholicæ ſatis conſtet; although it is ſufficiently evident, by many declarations made both at Conſtance, & here at Baſil, that theſe are truths of the Catholike faith, yet for the better confirming of all Catholikes herein, This holy Synod doth define as followeth; The verity of the power of a generall Councill above the Pope, declared in the generall Councill at Conſtance, and in this at Baſil, eſt veritas fidei Catholicæ*, is a veritie of the Catholike faith; and after a ſecond concluſion like to this, they adjoyne a third, which concernes them both; He who pertinaciouſly gainſayeth theſe two verities, *eſt cenſendus hæreticus, is to be accounted an heretike.* Thus the Councill at *Baſil*; cleerly witneſſing, that till this time of the Councill, the defending of the Popes authority to be ſupreme, or his judgement to be infallible, was eſteemed an Hereſie by the Catholike Church, and the maintainers of that doctrine to be heretikes: which their decrees were not, as ſome falſly pretend, rejected by the Popes of thoſe times, but ratified and confirmed, and that [r] *Conſiſtorialiter*, judicially and cathedrally by the indubitate Popes, that then were, for ſo the Councill of *Baſil* witneſſeth; who hearing that *Eugenius* would diſſolve the Councill, ſay [s] thus; *It is not likely that Eugenius will any way thinke to diſſolve this ſacred Councill, eſpecially ſeeing that it is againſt the decrees of the Councill at Conſtance, per prædeceſſorem ſuum et ſeipſum approbata; which both his predeceſſor Pope Martine the fift, and himſelfe alſo hath approved.* Beſides this, that *Eugenius* confirmed the Councill at *Baſil*, there are other evident proofes: His owne Bull, or emboſſed letters, wherein he ſaith [t] of this Councill, *purè, ſimpliciter, ac cum effectu, et omni devotione proſequimur; we embrace ſincerely, abſolutely, and with all affection and devotion, the generall Councill at Baſil:* The Councill often mention his adheſion, [u] his *maximã adhæſionem* [x] to the Council; by which Adheſion, as they teach, [y] *Decreta corroborata ſunt*, the Decrees of the Council at *Baſil* made for the ſuperiority of a Council above the Pope, were cõfirmed: Further yet the Orators w^ch^ Pope *Eug.* ſent to the council, did not only promiſe, but [z] *corporally ſweare* before *the whole Councill*, that they would defend the decrees ther-of, & particularly that which was made at *Conſtance* was, & now renewed at *Baſil.* Such an Harmonie there was in beleeving and profeſſing this doctrine, (that the Popes judgement in cauſes of faith, is neither ſupreme nor infallible) that generall Councils at this time decreed it, the indubitate Popes confirmed it, the Popes Orators ſolemnly ſware unto it, the Vniverſall [a] and Catholike Church untill then embraced it, and that with ſuch conſtancy and uniforme conſent, that, as the Council of [b] *Baſil* ſaith, (and their ſaying is worthy to be remembred) *nunquam aliquis peritorum dubitavit, never any learned and skilfull man doubted ther-*

of

q *Seſſ.* 33.

r *Per Concilia generalia, quæ ſummi Pontifices Conſiſtorialiter declaraverunt eſſe legitima, etiam pro eo tempore, quo ejuſmodi declarationes ediderunt. Conc. Baſil. pa.* 144. *a.*

s *Epiſt. Conc. Baſil. pa.* 100. *b.*

t *Literæ bullatæ Eugenij lectæ ſunt in Conc. Baſ. Seſſ.* 16.

u *In ſua adhæſione. ſeſſ.* 16.

x *Decreto quinque Concil. pa.* 96. *b.*

y *Seſſ.* 29. *pa.* 98. *b.*

z *Jurabant ejus decreta defendere, &c. Seſſ.* 16.

a *Hæc veritas totiès et tam ſolenniter per vniverſam eccleſiam declarata eſt. Epiſt. Conc. Baſ. pa.* 144. *a.*

b *In decreto quinq; concluſ. pa.* 96.

of. It may be ſome illiterate *Gnatho* hath ſoothed the Pope in his *Hildebrandicall* pride, vaunting, [c] *Se, quaſi deus ſit, errare non poſſe; I ſit in the temple of God, as God, I cannot erre*; but for any that was truly judicious or learned, never any ſuch man, in all the ages of the Church untill then, as the Councill witneſſeth, ſo much as doubted thereof, but conſtantly beleeved the Popes authoritie not to be ſupreme, and his judgement not to be infallible.

c Hildebrandum ſic gloriari ſolitum teſtatur Avent. lib. 5. Annal. pa. 455.

31. After the Councill of *Baſil*, the ſame truth was ſtill embraced in the Church, though with far greater oppoſition then before it had: witneſſe hereof, *Nich. Cuſanus* a Biſhop, a Cardinall, a man *ſcientijs pene omnibus excultus*, who lived 20 [e] yeares after the end of the Councill at *Baſil*. He earneſtly maintained the decree of that Councill, reſolving [f] that a generall Councill is *omni reſpectu tam ſupra Papam quam ſupra ſedem Apoſtolicam; is in every reſpect ſuperior both to the Pope and to the Apoſtolike ſee.* Which he proveth by the Councils of *Nice*, of *Chalcedon*, of the fixt and 8 generall Councils, and he is ſo confident herein, that he ſaith, *Quis dubitare poteſt ſanæ mentis? what man being in his wits can doubt of this ſuperioritie?* Witneſſe *Iohn de Turrecremata*, a Cardinall alſo, who was famous at the ſame time, [g] *He thought he was very unequall to the Councill at Baſil*, in fauour belike of *Eugenius* the 4, who [h] made him *Cardinall*, yet that he thought the Popes judge ment in defining cauſes of faith to be *fallible, and his authority not ſupreme, but ſubject to a Councill. Andradius* will tell you [i] in this manner; Let us heare him (*Turrecremata*) affirming that the Definitions of a Council concerning doctrines of faith, are to be preferred *Iudicio Rom. Pontificis, to the judgement of the Pope*; and then he citeth the words of *Turrec.* that in caſe the Fathers of a generall Councill ſhould make a definition of faith, which the Pope ſhould contradict (This was the very caſe of the fift Councill, and Pope *Vigilius*) *dicerem, judicio meo, quod Synodo ſtandum eſſet et non perſonæ Papæ, I would ſay, according to my judgement, that we muſt ſtand to the Synods, and not to the Popes ſentence:* who yet further touching [k] that the Pope hath no ſuperior Iudge upon earth, *extra caſum hæreſis, unleſſe it be in caſe of hereſie*, doth plainly acknowledge, that in ſuch a caſe a Councill is ſuperior unto him. Superior, I ſay, not onely (as he minceth the matter) by authoritie [l] of diſcretive judgement, or amplitude of learning (in which ſort many meane Biſhops and preſbyters are far his ſuperiors) but even by power of *Iuriſdiction*, ſeeing in that caſe (as he confeſſeth) the Councill is a ſuperior Iudge unto the Pope, and if he be a Iudge of him, he muſt have coactive [m] authoritie, and judiciall power over him. Witneſſe *Panormitane*, an Archbiſhop, and a Cardinall [n] alſo, a man of great note in the Church, both at and after the Councill of *Baſil*; He [o] profeſſeth that in thoſe things, which concerne the Faith, or generall ſtate of the Church; *Concilium eſt ſupra Papam, the Councill in thoſe things is ſuperior to the Pope.* He alſo writ a booke in defence of the

d Poſſ. Biblic. in Nic. Cuſano.
e Obyt ann. 1464. Poſſ. Conc. autem fi' nitum eſt an. 1442.
f Lib. 2. de Concor. Cathol. ca. 17.
g Claruit an. 1460. Tritem. de Scrip. eccl. in Ioh. de Tur.
h Poſſ. in Ioh. Tur.
i Lib. de author. gener. Concil. pa. 88.
k Turr. ſumm. de eccl. lib. 2. cap. 93.
l Tunc Synodus major eſt Papa, nõ quidem poteſtate juriſd ctionis, ſed authoritate diſcretivi judicij. Turrec.
m Bel. lib. 2. de ver. Dei. ca. 9. § Præterea. Et lib. 2. de cõcil. ca. 18.
n Poſſ. in Nich. Tudiſc.
o Cap. Significaſti. de Elect. extrav.

Councill

Councill at *Basill* so distastfull to the present Church of *Rome*, *that they have forbid* [p] *it to be read*, and reckned it in the number of Prohibited bookes in their Romane *Index*. At the same time lived [q] *Antonius Rosellus*, a man noble in birth, but more for learning, who thus writeth, [r] *I conclude, that the Pope may be accused and deposed for no fault, nisi pro hæresi*, but for heresie strictly taken, or for some notorious crime scãdalizing the whole Church: and againe, [s] Though the Pope be not content or willing to be judged by a Councill, yet in case of heresie, the Councill may condemne and adnull *sententiam Papæ, the Iudgement or sentence of faith pronounced by the Pope*; and he gives this reason thereof, because in this case the Councill is *supra Papam, above the Pope:* and the superior Iudge may be sought unto, to declare a nullitie in the sentence of the inferiour Iudge. Thus he: and much more to this purpose. Now although by these (the first of which was a *Belgian*, the second a *Spaniard*, the third a *Sicilian*, and the last an *Italian*) it may be perceived, that the generall judgement of the Church at that time, and the best learned therein, was almost the same with that of the Councill at *Basill*, that neither the Popes authoritie is supreme, nor his judgement in causes of faith is infallible; yet suffer me to adde two other witnesses, of those who were after that Councill.

p Pos. *loco citat.*

q *Obyt an.* 1467. *Vritem. in Ant. Ros.*

r *Monarch. part.* 2. *ca.* 15.

s *Li. eod. par.* 3 *c.* 21

32. The former is the Iudgement of Vniversities, *quæ* [t] *fere omnes, which all, in a manner, approved and honored that Councill of Basil*; The other is the Councill at *Biturice* (some [u] take it for *Burdeaux*) called by *Charles* the seventh, the French King, in which was made *consensu omnium* [x] *ecclesiasticorum, et principum regni, by the consent of the whole clergy, and all the Peeres of France*, that *Pragmaticall Sanction*, which *Iohn Marius* calls [y] *medullam, the pith and marrow of the decrees of the Councill at Basil*. One decree of that Sanction is this, [z] The authoritie of the Councill at *Basil* and the constancie of their decrees, *perpetua esto, let it be perpetuall, and let none, no not the Pope himselfe, presume to abrogate or infringe the same*. This *Sanction* was published with full authoritie, not seventy yeares before the Councill at *Lateran* (as *Leo* the tenth witnesseth [a]) that is, some foure yeares after the end of the Councill at *Basill*. And although the Popes (whose avarice and ambition was restrained by that sanction) did detest it, as *Gagninus* saith, [b] *non secus ac perniciosam hæresin; no otherwise then as a dangerous heresie*, yea and labored tooth & naile to admit it, yet, as saith the universitie of *Paris*, [c] by Gods helpe, *hactenus prohibitum extitit, they have beene ever hindred untill this time of Leo the tenth.* Indeed *Pius secundus* indevored and labored with *Lewes* the 11. to have it abrogated, and he sent [d] a solemne embassador, *Card. Balveus*, a very subtill fellow, to bring this to passe, but after much toyling both himselfe and others, *re infecta redijt, he returned without effecting the Popes desire*. And to goe no further, *Leo* the 10. and his *Laterane* Synod, are ample witnesses that this

t Orthuin. Gra. *in fasc. rer. expet. pa.* 240.

u Ortel. *Synon.*

x Ioh. Marius *lib. descbis. & conc. ca.* 23.

y *Ibid.*

z Gag. *annal. Fran. Lib.* 10.

a *Abipsius Sanctionis editione vix annos* 70 *fluxisse. Cõc. Later. Sess.* 11. *pa.* 639. *b. Loquitur autem de secunda ejus edit. nam antea promulgata erat an.* 1438. *teste Gag. & Mario.*

b *Lib.* 10.

c *In sua Appel. à Leon.* 10. *ad Concil.*

d Io. *Mas. lib. citat. ca.* 14.

e *Homo versutus, planeq; perversus. ib.*

Sanction

Sanction was never repealed, before that Synod, for they [f] complaine that, by reaſon of the malignitie of thoſe times, or elſe becauſe they could not helpe it, his predeceſſors *toleraſſe viſi ſunt, ſeemed to have tolerated that pragmaticall Sanction*, and that for all, which either they did or could doe, the ſame Sanction *retroactis temporibus viguiſſe, et adhuc vigere*; had in former times, and did even to that very day of their eleventh Seſſion, ſtand in force, and full vigor. Now ſeeing that *Sanction* condemneth as hereticall (as did the Council alſo of *Baſil*) that aſſertion of the Popes Supremacie of authoritie, and infallibilitie of judgment in defining cauſes of faith, which the preſent Romane Church defendeth, it is now cleerly demonſtrated that the ſame Aſſertion was taught, profeſſed, and beleeved to be an hereſie, and the obſtinate defenders thereof to be heretikes, by the conſenting judgement of Councils, Popes, Biſhops, and the Catholike Church, even from the Apoſtles time unto that very day of their *Laterane* Seſsion, which was the 19. of *December*, in the yeare 1516. after Chriſt.

[f] *Conc. Later. ſeſſ. 11*

33 On that day (*a day never to be forgotten by the preſent Romane Church*, it being the *birth-day* thereof,) *Leo* the tenth with his *Laterane* Councill (or as the learned Divines of *Paris* [g] account it, Conſpiracie, they being not aſſembled in Gods name) aboliſhed, as much as in them lay, the old and Catholike doctrine, which in all ages of the Church had beene beleeved and profeſſed untill that day, and in ſtead thereof erect a new faith, yea, a new foundation of the faith; and with it a new Church alſo. Hee and his Synod then reprobated [h] the Decree of *Conſtance* for the ſuperioritie of a Councill above the Pope: they reprobated [i] alſo the Councill of *Baſil*, and the ſame Decree renewed by them. That Councill they condemne as *Conciliabulum*, or [k] *Conventiculam, quæ nullum robur habere potuerit, As a Conſpiracie, and Conventicle, which could have no force at all.* They reprobated the [l] *Pragmaticall Sanction*, wherein the Decree of *Conſtance* and *Baſil* was for ever confirmed. Now that Decree being conſonant to that catholike Faith which for 1500 yeares together had beene imbraced, and beleeved by the whole catholike Church untill that day, in reprobating it, they rejected and reprobated the old and catholike Faith of the whole Church. In ſtead hereof they decreed the Popes authoritie to be [m] ſupreme, that it is, *de* [n] *neceſſitate ſalutis; a thing neceſſary to ſalvation, for all Chriſtians to be ſubject to the Pope*; and that not onely as they are ſeverally conſidered, but even as they aſſembled together in a generall Councill: for they define *Solum Romanum Pontificem* [o] *authoritatem ſuper omnia Concilia habere; The Pope alone to have authoritie above all Generall Councills.* This the Councill at *Laterane diſerte & ex profeſſo docuit; taught cleerly and purpoſely*, as *Bellarmine* tells [p] us: nay, they did not onely teach it, but *expreſsiſsimè definiunt* [q], they did moſt expreſly define it. And that their Definition

[g] *Leo 10. in quadam cætu, neſcimus qualiter, tamen non in Spiritu Domini congregato. App. Univ. Pariſ.*

[h] *Quæ de authoritate Concilij ſupra Pontificem conſtituerunt. ſententia Cõc. Lateranenſis plane reprobata ſunt. Bin. Not. in Conc. Conſt. § Ex parte.*

[i] *Reprobarunt decretum Concilij Baſilienſis. Bel. lib. 2. de Conc. ca. 17. § Denique.*

[k] *Conc. Lat. ſeſſ. 11.*

[l] *Ibid.*

[m] *Hujus ſanctæ ſedis ſuprema authoritate. Ibid. pa. 640.*

[n] *Ibid.*

[o] *Ibid. pa. 639.*

[p] *Lib. 2. de Concil. ca. 17. § Denique*

[q] *Lib. eod. ca. 13. § Deinde.*

finition is no other then a *Decree of Faith*, as the ſame Cardinall aſſures us; Decrees of faith (ſaith he)[r] are immutable, neyther may ever be repealed after they are once ſet downe; *Tale autem eſt hoc de quo agimus*, and ſuch is this Decree for the Popes ſupreme authoritie over all, even Generall Councils, made in their *Laterane* Synod. And what meane they (thinke you) by that ſupreme authoritie? Truly the ſame which *Bellarmine* explaineth, That becauſe his authoritie is ſupreme, therefore his judgement[s] in cauſes of Faith, is the *laſt and higheſt:* and becauſe it is the laſt and higheſt, therefore it is [t] *infallible*. So by their Decree, together with ſupremacie of authority, they have given *infallibilitie* of judgement to the Pope; and defined that to be a catholike truth, and doctrine of Faith, which the whole Church in all ages untill then, taught, profeſſed, and defined to be an hereſie, and all who maintaine it, to be Heretikes, and for ſuch condemned both it and them.

r *Lib. eod. ca.* 17. § *Ad hunc.*

s *Proinde ultimum judicium ſummi pontificis eſſe. lib.* 4. *de Rom. pontif. ca.* 1. § *Sed nec.*

t *Reſtat igitur ut Papa ſit Iudex (ultimus) et proinde nõ poſſit errare. Lib.* 4. *de Pont. Rom. ca.* 3. § *Contra. Et Dicũt Concilij ſententiam eſſe ultimũ judicium Hinc autem apertiſſimè ſequitur, non errare. Lib.* 2. *de Conc. ca.* 3. § *Accedat.*

34 Now, becauſe this is not onely a doctrine of their faith, but the very *foundation*, on which all their other doctrines of faith doe relie, by decreeing this, they have quite altered not onely the faith, but the whole frame and fabricke of the church, erecting a new Romane church, conſiſting of them, and them onely, who maintaine the Popes *Infallibilitie* and ſupremacie, decreed on that memorable day in their *Laterane* Synod: a church truly new, and but of yeſterday, not ſo old as *Luther*, a church in faith and communion ſevered from all former generall Councils, Popes, and Biſhops, that is, from the whole catholike Church of Chriſt, which was from the Apoſtles times untill that day. And if their Popes continue (as it is to be preſumed they doe) to make that profeſsion which by the *Councils* of *Conſtance* and *Baſil* they are bound to doe, to hold among other, this fift Councill *ad unum iõta*, this certainly is but a verball, no cordiall profeſsion; there neither is, nor can be any ttuth therein, it being impoſſible to beleeve both the Popes *Cathedrall* judgement in cauſes of faith, to be *hereticall*, as the fift *Councill* defined; and the Popes *Cathedrall* ſentence in ſuch cauſes, to be *infallible*, as their *Laterane Councill* decreed: So by that profeſſion is demonſtrated that their doctrine of faith is both contradictory to it ſelfe, ſuch as none can poſſibly beleeve, and withall new, ſuch as is repugnant to that faith which the *whole Catholike Church of Chriſt* embraced, untill that very day of their *Laterane* Seſſion.

35 Yea and even then was not this holy truth aboliſhed. Foure moneths did not paſſe after that *Laterane* Decree was made but it was condemned by the whole Vniverſitie of [u] *Paris*, as being *contra fidem Catholicam*, againſt the catholike Faith, and the authority of holy Councils. And even to theſe dayes the *French Church* doth not onely diſtaſte that [x] *Laterane* Decree, and hold a Generall Councill to be ſuperiour to the Pope, but their

v *In Appel. à Leon.* 10. *quæ facta eſt* 21 *die Mart. an.* 1517. *Decret. Later. fact.* 19 *Decemb.* 1517.

x A Relation of Religion in the Weſt parts, publiſhed *an.* 1605. *pa.* 129.

their Councill alſo of *Trent*, wherein that *Laterane* Decree is confirmed, is by them rejected. And what ſpeake I of them? Behold, while *Leo* with his *Laterane Councill* ſtrives to quench this catholike truth, it burſts out with farre more glorious and reſplendent beauty. This ſtone, which was rejected by thoſe builders of *Babylon*, was laid againe in the foundations of *Sion*, by thoſe *Ezra's*, *Nehemiah's*, *Zorobabel's* and holy Servants of the Lord, who at the voyce of the Angell, came out of *Babylon*, and repaired the ruines of *Ieruſalem*. And even as certaine rivers are ſaid to runne [z] under or through the ſalt Sea, and yet to receive no ſalt or bitter taſte from it, but at length to burſt out, & ſend forth their owne ſweet and delightfull waters: Right ſo it fell out with this and ſome other doctrines of Faith. This Catholike truth (that the Popes judgement and *Cathedrall* ſentence in cauſes of faith is not infallible) borne in the firſt age of the Church, and ſpringing from the Scriptures and Apoſtles, as from the holy mountaines of God, for the ſpace of 600 yeares and more, paſſed with a moſt faire and ſpatious current, like *Tygris* & *Euphrates* watering on each ſide the Garden of the Lord; or like *Pactolus*, with golden ſtreames inriching and beautifying the Church of God: after that time it fell into the corrupted waters of ſucceeding ages, brackiſh (I confeſſe) before their ſecond *Nycene* Synod, but after it and the next unto it, extremely ſalt and unpleaſant, more bitter then the waters of *Mara*. And although the nearer it came to the ſtreets of *Babylon*, it was ſtill more mingled with the ſlime or mud of their *Babyloniſh* ditches; yet, for all that dangerous and long mixture, continuing about the ſpace of [a] 730. yeares, this truth all that time kept her native and primitive ſweetneſſe, by the conſtant and ſucceſſive profeſſions of the whole Church throughout all thoſe ages. Now after that long paſſage through all thoſe ſalt waves, like *Alpheus*, or *Arethuſa*, it burſts out againe, not as they did, in *Sicily*, nor neare the *Italian* ſhores, but (as the *Cardinall* tells [b] us) in *Germanie*, in *England*, in *Scotland*, in *France*, in *Helvetia*, in *Polonia*, in *Bohemia*, in *Pannonia*, in *Sueveland*, in *Denmarke*, in *Norway*, in all the Reformed Churches, and being by the power and goodneſſe of God, purified from all that mud and corruption wherewith it was mingled; (all which is now left in it owne proper, that is, in the *Romane*, channels;) it is now preſerved in the faire current of thoſe Orthodoxall Churches, wherein both it and other holy doctrines of Faith, are with no leſſe ſinceritie profeſſed, thē they were in thoſe ancient times before they were mingled with any bitter or brackiſh waters.

36 You ſee now the whole judgement of the Fift Generall Councill, how in every point it contradicteth the *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution* of Pope *Vigilius*, condemning and accurſing both it for hereticall, and all who defend it for heretikes: which their ſentence, you ſee, is conſonant to the Scriptures, and the whole Catholike

y *Gentil. Exam. Cōc. Trid. Seſſ. 13. & Car. Mol. dec. Conc. Trid. decret. pa. 3.*

z *Alpheum fama eſt huc Elidis amnem, Occultas egiſſe viam ſubter mare. Virg. lib. 3. Æneid.*

a *Tot anni interſunt à Conc. Nic. 2. quod habitum eſt an. 787, ad annum quo Lutherus ſe primum oppoſuit indulgē. ijs papalibus & pontifici, qui fuit an. 1517 (Cecl. in vita Luther.*

b *Brevi occupavit (Lutheri hæreſis) multa regna. Bel. l. 3. de pontif. ca. 23. § Similitudo. Et, Romana ſedes amiſit noſtris temporibus magnam Germaniæ partem, Suetiam, Gothiam, Norvegiam, Daniam univerſam, bonam Angliæ, Galliæ, Helvetiæ, Poloniæ, Bohemiæ, ac Pannoniæ partem, lib. eod. ca. 21. § Ac poſtea.*

Catholike Church of all ages, excepting none but ſuch as adhere to their new *Laterane* decree and faith. An example ſo ancient, ſo authenticall, and ſo pregnant to demonſtrate the truth, which wee teach, and they oppugne, that it may juſtly cauſe any Papiſt in the world to ſtagger, and ſtand in doubt, even of the maine ground and foundation whereon all his faith relyeth. For the full clearing of which matter, being of ſo great importance and conſequence, I have thought it needful to rip up every veine and ſinew in this whole cauſe, concerning theſe *Three Chapters*, and the *Conſtitution* of *Vigilius* in defence of the ſame: and withall examine the weight of every doubt, evaſion, & excuſe, which eyther *Cardinall Baronius*, (who is *inſtar omnium*) or *Binius*, or any other, moveth or pretendeth herein; not willingly, nor with my knowledge, omitting any one reaſon, or circumſtance, which either they urge, or which may ſeeme to advantage or help them, to decline the inevitable force of our former Demonſtration.

Cap. V.

The firſt Exception of Baronius, *pretending that the cauſe of the* Three Chapters *was no cauſe of faith, refuted.*

1 THere is not, as I thinke, any one cauſe which *Card. Baronius* in all the Volumes of his *Annalls* hath with more art or induſtry handled, then this concerning Pope *Vigilius*, and *the Fift Generall Councill*. In this hee hath ſtrained all his wits, moved and removed every ſtone, under which hee imagined any help might be found, eyther wholly to excuſe, or any way leſſen the errour of *Vigilius*. All the *Cardinalls* forces may be ranked into foure ſeverall troupes. In the firſt do march all his Shifts and Evaſions which are drawne from the Matter of the *Three Chapters*: In the ſecond, thoſe which are drawne from the *Popes Conſtitution*: In the third, thoſe which reſpect a ſubſequent Act of *Vigilius*: In the fourth & laſt, thoſe which concerne the fift General Councill. After all theſe, wherin cõſiſteth the whole pith of the Cauſe, the *Cardinall* brings forth another band of certaine ſubſidiary, but moſt diſorderly ſouldiers, nay, not ſouldiers; they never tooke the Military oath, nor may they by the Law of armes nor ever were by any worthy Generall admitted into any lawfull fight, or ſo much as to ſet footing in the field; meere theeves and robbers they are, whom the *Cardinall* hath ſet in an ambuſh, not to fight in the cauſe, but onely like ſo many *Shimei's*, that they might raile at and revile whomſoever the *Cardinall* takes a ſpleene at, or with whatſoever hee ſhall be moved in the heat of his choler: At the Emperour *Iuſtinian*, at *Theodora*

Theodora the Empreſſe, at the cauſe it ſelfe of the *Three Chapters*, at the *Imperiall Edict*, at *Theodorus* Biſhop of *Ceſarea*, at the *Synodal* acts, yea, at Pope *Vigilius* himſelfe; we wil firſt encounter the juſt forces of the Cardinall, which onely are his lawfull warriours; and having diſcomfited them, we ſhall with eaſe cleare all the coaſts of this cauſe, from all his theeviſh, piraticall, and diſordered ſtraglers.

2. The firſt and chiefeſt exception of *Baronius* ariſeth from the matter & controverſie it ſelfe touching theſe *Three Chapters*; concerning which he pretendeth, that no queſtion of faith was handled therin, & ſo one diſſenting from another in this cauſe, might not be counted or called an heretike. This was a queſtion ſaith he, [a] *de perſonis, & non de fide; of perſons and not of the faith.* Againe, [b] *Vigilius* knew, *Non de fide eſſe quæſtionem, ſed de perſonis; that there was no queſtion moved herein about the faith, but about certaine perſons.* And yet more clearly, In theſe diſputations, ſaith he, [c] about the *Three Chapters*, as we have oftē ſaid, *Nulla fuit quæſtio de fide, ut alter ab altero aliter ſentiens dici poſſet hæreticus; there was no queſtion at all about the faith, ſo that one diſſenting from another herein, might be called an heretike.* And this hee ſo confidently avoucheth, that he ſaith of it, *Ab omnibus abſque ulla controverſia conſentitur; all men agree herein without any controverſie.* Thus *Baronius*, whom *Binius* applauding, ſaith, [d] *Sciendum eſt, bee it knowne to all men*, that in theſe diſputations and differences about the *Three Chapters*, *non fuiſſe quæſtionem ullam de fide, ſed tantummodo de perſonis; there was no quæſtion at all concerning the faith, but only concerning the perſons.* So he. Whereby they would inſinuate, that Pope *Vigilius* did erre onely in a perſonall cauſe, or in a matter of fact, which they not unwillingly confeſſe that the Pope may doe; but he erred not in a cauſe of faith, or in any doctrinall poſition of faith, wherein onely they defend him to bee infallible.

a *An.* 547. *nu.* 30 & *nu.* 225.
b *Ibid. nu.* 46.
c *Ibid. nu* 231.
d *Not. in Conc.* 5. §. *Neque.*

3. Truly the Card. was driven to an extreme exigent, when this poore ſhift muſt be the firſt and beſt ſhelter to ſave the *infallibility of the Apoſtolike Chaire.* For to ſay truth, the maine controverſie touching theſe *Three Chapters*, which the Councell condēned, and *Vigilius* defended, was onely doctrinall, and directly belonging to the faith; nor did it concerne the perſons any other way, but with an implication of that hereticall doctrine which they and the defenders of theſe Chapters under that colour did cunningly maintaine: A truth ſo evident that I doe even labour with abundance of proofes.

4. *Iuſtinian* the religious Emperour, who called this Councell about this matter, committed it unto them, as a queſtion of faith: *We have*, ſaith he, [e] *commanded Vigilius to come together with you all, and debate theſe* Three Chapters, *that a determination may be given, rectæ fidei conveniens, conſonant to the right faith.* Againe, ſtirring [f] them up to give a ſpeedy reſolution in this cauſe, hee

e *Epiſt. ad Synod. Coll.* 1. *pa.* 520. *a.*
f *Ibid. b.*

addes this as a reaſon, *Quoniã qui de fide rectâ interrogatur; for when one is asked concerning the right faith, and puts off his anſwer therein, this is nothing elſe but a deniall of the true confeßion; for in queſtions & anſwers quæ de fide ſunt, which are queſtions of faith, hee that is more prompt and ready is acceptable with God.* Thus the Emperour.

5. The Holy Councell eſteemed it, as did the Emperour, to be no other than a cauſe or queſtion of faith; for thus they ſay,
h *Coll.8.pag.384.a.* *Cum* h *de fide ratio movetur, when a doubt or queſtion is moved touching the faith,* even he is to be condemned, who may hinder impiety, but is negligent ſo to doe; and therefore, *Feſtinavimus bonum fidei ſemen conſervare ab impietatis Zizaniis; We have haſtened to preſerve the good ſeed of faith pure from the tares of impietie.* So cleerly doth the whole generall Councell even in their definitive ſentence call the condemning of the *Three Chapters* which themſelves did, a preſerving of the good ſeed of faith; and the defending of them, which *Vigilius* did, a ſowing of hereticall weeds
m *Ibid.pa.586.b.* which corrupt the faith. Againe, m *We being enlightned by the holy Scriptures, and the doctrine of the holy Fathers,* have thought it needfull to ſet downe in certaine Chapters, (thoſe are the particular points of their Synodall judgement) *Et prædicationem veritatis, & hæreticorum eorumque impietatis condemnationem; both the preaching of the truth, or true faith, and the condemning of Heretikes, and their impietie.* And in the end, having ſet downe thoſe Chapters, and among them a particular and expreſſe condemning of theſe *Three* w^th^ an anathema denounced to the defenders of thẽ,
n *Ibid.pa.588.a.* they conclude thus, n *We have confeſſed theſe things, being delivered unto us both by the ſacred Scriptures, by the doctrine of the holy Fathers, & by thoſe things* w^ch^ *are defined, de unâ eâdemq; fide, concerning one and the ſame faith by the foure former Councels.* Then which nothing can be more cleare to witneſſe their decree touching theſe *Threee Chapters* moſt nearely to concerne the faith, unleſſe ſome of *Baronius* his friends can make proofe, that the condemning of heretikes, and their impious hereſies, and the maintaining of that doctrine which the Scriptures and Fathers taught, and the foure firſt Councels defined, is not a point of faith.

6. Neither onely did the Catholikes which were the condemners of theſe *Three Chapters*, but the heretikes alſo which were the defenders of them, they alſo conſent in this truth, that the queſtion concerning them, was a controverſie or cauſe of
o *Apud Bar.an. 553.nu.106.107. 108.& alibi.* faith. Pope *Vigilius* in his Conſtitution o ſtill pretendeth his Defence of Thoſe Chapters *to be conſonant to the Councell at Chalcedon, and the Definition thereof:* and of the Epiſtle of *Ibas* hee expreſly ſaith, *The Councel of Chalcedon pronounced it to be orthodoxall.* And none I ſuppoſe will doubt, but that the queſtion, whether that or any other writing be orthodoxall, and agreeable to the *Definition* of *Chalcedon*, as *Vigilius* affirmed that Epiſtle to be; or be heretical and repugnant to that *Definition*, as the Holy Councell adjudged that Epiſtle to be, is a plaine queſtion and controverſie

verſie of faith. *Victor* B. of *Tunen*, who ſuffered impriſonment and baniſhment for defence of theſe *Three Chapters*, teacheth the like, ſaying, [p] *That Epiſtle of* Ibas *was approved and judged* [q] *orthodox all, by the ſentence of the Councell at Chalcedon: and the condemning of theſe* Three Chapters, *is the condemning and baniſhing of that Councell.* *Facundus* B. of *Hermian*, who writ ſeven bookes of theſe *Three Chapters*, doth more than abundantly witneſſe this of him. *Victor* thus writeth, [r] *Evidentiſsime declaravit*, *Facundus hath declared moſt evidently*, that thoſe *Three Chapters* were condemned *in proſcriptione fidei Catholicæ & Apoſtolicæ*, *for the exiling and rooting out of the Catholike and Apoſtolike faith.* *Facundus* himſelfe doth not onely affirme this, but prove it alſo, even by the judgement of Pope *Vigilius*. *Vigilius*, ſaith he, [s] *eſteemed the condemning of theſe Three Chapters to be ſo hainous a crime, that hee thought it fit to be reproved by thoſe words of the Apoſtle, Avoid prophane novelties of words, and oppoſition of ſcience falſely ſo called, which ſome profeſſing have erred from the faith.* And hereupon, as if he meant purpoſely to refute this Evaſion of *Baronius*, which it ſeemeth ſome did uſe in thoſe dayes, he addes, *Quid adhuc quæritur utrum contra fidem factum fuerit; why doe any as yet doubt whether the condemning of them be againſt the faith*, ſeeing Pope *Vigilius* calleth it prophane noveltie and oppoſition of ſcience, whereby ſome have erred from the faith? And a little after concluding, This ſaith he, [t] is not to be thought ſuch a cauſe as may bee tolerated for the peace of the Church, *ſed quæ merito judicatur contra ipſius fidei Catholicæ ſtatum commota; but it muſt bee judged ſuch a cauſe as is moved againſt the ſtate of the Catholike faith.* Thus *Facundus* teſtifying both his owne, and the judgement of the other defenders of thoſe Chapters, and by name of Pope *Vigilius*, that they all eſteemed and judged this to bee a queſtion and controverſie of faith, of which *Baronius* tels us, that in it there was moved no queſtion at all concerning the faith; and that Pope *Vigilius* knew that it was no queſtion of faith.

p *In Chron. an. 2. poſt Conſul. Baſilij.*
q *Iudicio Synodi approbata, & orthodoxa judicata eſt. ibid.*
r *In ſuo Chron. an. 10. poſt Conſul. Baſilij.*
s *Lib 4. pro defenſ. trium Capit apud Bar. an. 546. nu. 57.*
t *Ibid. nu. 58.*

7. Now whereas the whole Church at that time was divided into [u] two parts, the Eaſterne Churches with the holy Councell condemning; the Weſterne with Pope *Vigilius* defending thoſe *Three Chapters*, ſeeing both the one ſide and the other conſent in this point, that this was *a cauſe* and queſtion of faith, what truth or credit thinke you, is there in *Baronius*, who ſaith, that All men without any doubt agree herein, that this is no cauſe or queſtion of faith: whereas *all*, both the one ſide and the other agree in the quite contrary. Truly the *wiſdome* of the Cardinall is well worthy obſerving. He conſenteth to *Vigilius* in defending the *Three Chapters*, wherein *Vigilius* was hereticall: but diſſenteth from *Vigilius* in holding this to be a cauſe of faith, wherein *Vigilius* was orthodoxal; as if he had made ſome *vow* to follow the Pope, when the Pope forſakes the truth, but to forſake the Pope, when the Pope followeth the truth.

u *Vniverſus fere orbis occidentalis ab orientali Eccleſia diviſus erat. Bin. not. in S. Conc. §. Concilium.*

8. Nor onely was this truth by that age acknowledged, but by ſucceeding, approved. By Pope *Pelagius*, who to reclame certaine Biſhops from defence of thoſe Chapters, wherin they were earneſt, and had writ an apologie for the ſame, uſeth this as one ſpeciall reaſon, becauſe all thoſe Chapters were repugnant to the Scriptures & former Councels. *Conſider*, ſaith he, [x] *if the writings of* Theodorus, *which deny Chriſt the Redeemer to bee the Lord, the writings of* Theodoret, *quæ contra fidem edita, which being publiſhed againſt the faith, were afterwards by himſelfe condemned*; and the Epiſtle of *Ibas*, wherein *Neſtorius the enemy of the Church is defended*; *if theſe bee conſonant to the Prophetical, Euangelicall, and Apoſtolicall authority.* And againe, [y] of the Epiſtle of *Ibas* he addeth, *If this Epiſtle be received as true, tota ſanctæ Epheſinæ Synodus fides diſſipatur, the whole faith of the holy Epheſine Councell is overthrowne.* Let here ſome of *Baronius* friends tell us how that queſtion or cauſe doth not concerne the faith, the defending whereof (which *Vigilius* did) is by the judgement of Pope *Pelagius* repugnant to the Euangelical and Apoſtolicall doctrines, and even an utter & totall overthrow of the faith. To *Pelagius* accordeth Pope *Gregory*, who approved [z] *this Epiſtle of Pelagius, & cõmended it as a direction to others in this cauſe.* And what ſpeake I of one or two, ſeeing the Decree of this fift Councell, wherein this is declared to be a cauſe of faith, is conſonant to all former, and confirmed by all ſucceeding generall Councels, Popes and Biſhops, til that time of *Leo* the 10. & his *Laterane* Synod, as before we [a] have ſhewed? was not this thinke you, moſt inſolent preſumption in *Baronius* to ſet himſelfe as a *Iohannes ad oppoſitum*, againſt them all, and oppoſe his owne fancy, to the conſtant and conſenting judgement of the whole Catholike Church for more than 1500 yeares together? Theſe all with one voyce profeſſe this to be a cauſe of faith: *Baronius* againſt them all maintaineth, that it is *no cauſe of faith*: and to heape up the full meaſure of his ſhame, addeth a vaſt untruth, for which no colour of excuſe can be deviſed; *Conſentitur ab omnibus*, that all men without any controverſie agree herein, that this is no queſtion nor cauſe of faith.

x *Epiſt. 7. §. Penſate.*

y *Ibid. § Sed cur.*

z *Lib. 2. Ind. 10. Epiſt. 36.*

a *Cap. 4.*

9. Beſides all theſe Card. *Bellarmine* ſetteth downe divers rules, and cleare tokens whereby one may certainly know when a Councell decreeth or propoſeth any doctrine *tanquam de fide*, *to be received as a doctrine of the Catholike faith.* This ſaith he, [b] *is eaſily knowne by the words of the Councell, for either they uſe to ſay, that they explicate the Catholike faith; or elſe, that they who thinke the contrary are to be accounted heretikes; or, which is moſt frequent, they anathematize thoſe who thinke the cõtrary.* So he. Let us now by theſe markes examine this cauſe, and it will be moſt evident, not onely by ſome one of them, which yet were ſufficient; but by them all, that the Holy Councell both held this controverſie to be of faith, and alſo propoſed their decree herein, as a Decree of faith.

b *Lib. 2. de Conc. ca. 12. § Quarto.*

10. For

10. For the firſt, the Councell in plaine termes profeſſeth *even* [c] *in their definitive ſentence, that in their Decree they explane that ſame doctrine which the Scriptures, the Fathers, and the foure former Councels had delivered in their definitions of faith.* Then undoubtedly by *Bellarmines* firſt note, their Decree herein is a Decree of faith, ſeeing it is an explication of the Catholike faith.

[c] *Coll.8.pa.588.a.*

11. For the ſecond, the Councel in like ſort, in plain termes calleth the defēders of thoſe *three Chapters*, heretikes. For thus cried al the Synod, [d] *He who doth not anathematize this Epiſtle, is an Heretike: He who receiveth it, is an Heretike: This we ſay all.* And in their definitive ſentence they profeſſe [e] that they ſet down the preaching of the truth, *& Hæreticorum condemnationem, and the condemning of Heretikes.* So by the ſecond marke of *Bellarmine* it is undoubted, that the Councels Decree herein is a Decree of faith.

[d] *Coll.6.pa.576.b.*

[e] *Coll.8.pa.*

12. The third note is more than demonſtrative. For the Holy Councell denounceth, not once or twice, but more I thinke than an hundred times an *Anathema* to them that teach contrary to their ſentence. *Anathema* [f] *to Theodorus; anathema to him that doth not anathematize Theodorus; we all anathematize Theodorus and his writings. Anathema* [g] *to the impious writing of Theodoret againſt Cyril: Anathema to all that doe not anathematize them; we* [h] *all anathematize the impious Epiſtle of Ibas: If* [i] *any defend this Epiſtle, or any part of it, if any doe not anathematize it, and the defenders of it, let him be an Anathema.*

[f] *Coll.4.pa.537.a. & Coll.8.pa.586.et 587.*

[g] *Coll.8.pa.587.b.*

[h] *Coll.6.pa.576.b.*

[i] *Coll.8.pa.587.b.*

13. So by all the notes of Cardinall *Bellarmine*, it is evident, not onely that this queſtion about the *Three Chapters*, is *a queſtion of faith*; but, which is more, that the holy generall Councell propoſed their Decree herein, *tanquam de fide, as a Decree of faith.* Now becauſe every Chriſtian is bound to beleeve *certitudine fidei cui falſum ſubeſſe non poteſt, with certainty of faith which cannot be deceived*, every doctrine and poſition of faith, then eſpecially when it is publiſhed and declared by a Decree of the Church to bee a doctrine of faith: Seeing by this Decree of faith which the Councell now made, not onely the Popes *Apoſtolicall* ſentence in a cauſe of faith, is condemned to bee hereticall, but all they alſo who defend it, to be Heretikes and accurſed; and ſeeing all defend it who maintaine the Popes cathedrall ſentence to be *infallible*, that is, *all who are members of the preſent Church of Rome*: it hence inevitably enſueth, that every Chriſtian is bound to beleeve *certitudine fidei cui falſum ſubeſſe non poteſt*, not onely the doctrine, even the *fundamentall* doctrine of the preſent Church of Rome to be hereticall, but all that maintaine it; that is, all that are members of that Church, to be heretikes and accurſed, unleſſe diſclaiming that hereſie they forſake all communion with that Church. *Baronius* perceiving all thoſe *Anathemaes* to fall inevitably upon himſelfe, and their whole Church, if this cauſe of the *Three Chapters* which *Vigilius* defended and defined by his *Apoſtolicall* Conſtitution, that they muſt be defen-

ded; if this I ſay were admitted to be a cauſe of faith, that hee might ſhuffle off thoſe *Anathemaes*, which like the leproſie of *Gehazi* doth cleave unto them; thought it the ſafeſt, as indeed it was the ſhorteſt way, to deny this to be a cauſe of faith, which not onely by all the precedent witneſſes, but by the judgement of their owne Cardinall, and all the three notes ſet downe by him, is undeniably proved to bee a cauſe of faith, and that the Decree of the Holy Councell concerning it, is propoſed as a Decree of faith.

14. I might further adde their owne *Nicholas Sanders*, who though he ſaw not much in matters of faith, yet he both ſaw and profeſſed this truth, and therefore in plaine termes calleth [k] the defending of the *Three Chapters* an hereſie. Now hereſie it could not be, unleſſe it were a cauſe of faith, ſeeing every hereſie is a deviation from the faith. But omitting him, and ſome others of his ranke, I will now in the laſt place adde one other witneſſe, which with the favourites of *Baronius* is of more weight and worth, than all the former, and that is *Baronius* himſelfe, who, as he doth often deny, ſo doth he often and plainly profeſſe this to be a cauſe of faith. Speaking of the Emperours Edict concerning theſe *Three Chapters*, he bitterly reproveth; yea, he reproacheth the Emperour for that he would [l] arrogate to himſelfe *edere ſanctiones de fide Catholica, to make Edicts about the Catholike faith.* Again, the whole Catholike faith, ſaith he, would [m] be in jeopardy, if ſuch as *Iuſtinian de fide leges ſanciret, ſhould make lawes concerning the faith.* Againe, [n] *Pelagius* the Popes Legate ſounded an alarum *contra ejuſdem Imperatoris de fide ſancitũ Edictũ, againſt the Emperors Edict publiſhed concerning the faith.* And yet againe, [o] Pope *Vigilius* writ letters againſt thoſe *qui edito ab Imperatore fidei decreto ſubſcripſiſſent, who had ſubſcribed to the Emperours Edict of faith.* So often, ſo expreſly doth *Baronius* profeſſe this to be a *cauſe of faith*, which himſelfe, like the *Æſopicall Satyr*, had ſo often, and ſo expreſly denied to be a cauſe of faith; and that alſo ſo confidently, that he ſhamed not to ſay, *Conſentitur ab omnibus, all men agree herein*, that this is no cauſe of faith; whereas *Baronius* himſelfe diſſenteth herein, confeſſing in plaine termes this to be a cauſe of the Catholike faith.

15. The truth is, the Cardinals judgement was unſetled, and himſelfe in a manner infatuated in handling this whole cauſe touching *Vigilius* and the fift generall Councell. For having once reſolved to deny this one truth, that *Vigilius* by his *Apoſtolicall* ſentence maintained and defined hereſie, and decreed that all other ſhould maintaine it, (which one truth, like a *Theſean* threed would eaſily and certainly have directed him in all the reſt of his Treatiſe;) now he wandreth up and down as in a Labyrinth, toiling himſelfe in uncertainties and contradictions, ſaying, and gainſaying, whatſoever either the preſent occaſiõ which he hath in hand, or the partialitie of his corrupted judgement, like a violent

[k] *Ob eaſdem hereſes decrevit eos eſſe alienos à diaconorũ honore. Lib. 7. de viſib. Monarch. an. 537.*

[l] *An. 546. nu. 41.*

[m] *An. eodẽ. nu. 43.*

[n] *Ibid. nu. 50.*

[o] *An. 547. nu. 50.*

lent tempeſt doth drive him unto; when the Emperour or his Edict (to both which he beares an implacable hatred) comes in his way, then this queſtion about the *Three Chapters*, muſt bee a cauſe of faith: for ſo the Cardinall may have a ſpacious field to declame againſt the Emperour for preſuming to intermeddle and make lawes in a cauſe of faith. But when Pope *Vigilius* or his *Conſtitution* (with which the Cardinall is moſt partially blinded) meet him, then the caſe is quite altered, the queſtion about the *Three Chapters* muſt then bee no more a queſtion or cauſe of faith; for that is an eaſie way to excuſe *Vigilius*, and the infallibilitie of his Chaire: he erred onely in ſome perſonall matters, in ſuch the Pope may erre; he erred not in any doctrinall point, nor in a cauſe of faith; in ſuch is hee and his Chaire infallible.

16. There remaineth one doubt, ariſing out of the words of *Gregory*, by the wilfull miſtaking whereof [p] *Baronius* was miſſeled. He ſeemeth to teach the ſame with the Cardinall, where ſpeaking of this fift Synod, hee ſaith, [q] *In eâ de perſonis tantummodo, non autem de fide aliquid eſt geſtum; In it was onely handled ſomewhat concerning thoſe perſons, but nothing concerning the faith.* So *Gregory*, whoſe words if they be taken without any limitation, are not onely untrue, but repugnant to the conſenting judgement of Councels and Fathers above mentioned, even to *Gregory* himſelfe: for ſpeaking of all the five Councels held before his time, he ſaith, [r] *Whoſoever embraceth, praedictarum Synodorum fidem, the faith explaned by thoſe five Councels, peace be unto them.* And if hee had not in ſuch particular manner teſtified this; yet ſeeing hee approveth (as was before [f] ſhewed) this fift Councel and the Decree therof; & ſeeing that Decree clearly expreſſeth this to have beene a cauſe of faith, grounded on Scriptures, and the definitions of faith ſet downe in former Councels; even thereby doth *Gregory* certainly imply, that he accounted this cauſe for no other than (as the Synod it ſelfe did) for a cauſe of faith.

p *An.* 547 *nu.* 30. & *an.* 553. *nu.* 231.
q *Lib.*3. *Epiſt.*37.
r *Lib.*1. *Epiſt.*24.
f *Ca.*4. *nu.*27.

17. What then is *Gregory* repugnant to himſelfe herein? I liſt not to cenſure ſo of him; rather by his owne words I deſire to explane his meaning. There were divers in his time, as alſo in his Predeceſſor's *Pelagius*, who condemned this fift Councell, becauſe, as they ſuppoſed, it had altered and aboliſhed the faith of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, by condemning theſe *Three Chapters*, and had eſtabliſhed a new doctrine of faith. *Gregorie* intreating againſt theſe, whom he truly calleth [t] malignant perſons, and troublers of the Church, denieth, and that moſt juſtly, that this Councell had done ought in the faith; not ſimply, as if they had done nothing at all, but nothing in ſuch a manner as thoſe malignant perſons intended; nothing that was contrary to the faith decreed at *Chalcedon*; nothing that was new, or uncouth in the doctrine of faith; in this manner the Councell did nothing in the faith. Heare the words of *Gregorie* expreſſing thus much; *Some there are* (ſaith hee) [u] *who affirme, that in the time of* Iulian

t *Exeuntes maligni homines turbaverunt animos veſtros. Lib.*2. *Epiſt.*10.
u *Lib.*3. *Epiſt.*3.

there was ſomewhat decreed againſt the Councell at Chalcedon; But ſuch men neither reading, neither beleeving thoſe who read, remaine in their errour; for we profeſſe, our conſcience bearing witneſſe unto us, de fide ejuſdem Concilij nihil eſſe motum, nihil violatum; that nothing concerning the faith of that Councell at Chalcedon, was here (in the fift Councell) moved or altered, nothing violated or hurt; but whatſoever was done in this fift Synod, it was done, that the faith of the Councell at Chalcedon ſhould in no ſort be infringed. So *Gregory*, who to like purpoſe againe ſaith, [x] *In the Synod concerning the* Three Chapters *it is manifeſt, nihil de fide convulſum eſſe, nihil immutatũ; that nothing concerning the faith was weakned, nothing changed therein.*

x *Lib. 2. Ind. 10. Epiſt. 36.*

18. Now as againſt their firſt calumnie, *Gregory* teacheth, that nothing was done contrary to the faith of the Councell at *Chalcedon*; ſo againſt their other he ſheweth, that they decreed no noveltie in the faith, nor ought elſe but what was formerly decreed at *Chalcedon*. To which purpoſe he ſaith [y] of this fift Synod, that it was *in omnibus ſequax, in every point an imitator & follower of the Councell at Chalcedõ:* & again [z] more clearly, In this fift Synod nothing elſe was done, *quã apud Chalcedonẽſem Synodũ fuerat conſtitutũ; then was formerly decreed in the Councel at Chalcedon.* So *Gregory*. Both this fift, & that at *Chalcedon* (as alſo the former at *Epheſus*) decreed one and the ſelfe ſame faith, as by *Gregory* is truly witneſſed: but the Councell at *Chalcedon* and *Epheſus* decreed it abſolutely, without any expreſſe reference to thoſe perſons or writings which are condemned in the fift, though in them both was *implicitè* contained a condemnation of all theſe *Three Chapters*; the fift Councell decreed it with an expreſſe reference to theſe Chapters, and an explicite condemnation of them. The Decrees made at *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon* were Introductive; as firſt condemning thoſe hereſies of *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches*. The Decree of this fift Councell was onely *Corroborative*, or *Declarative*, explaning and corroborating thoſe former decrees, by condemning theſe writings of *Theodorus*, *Theodoret*, and *Ibas*, which did overthrow the ſame. As *Vigilius* and other followers of *Neſtorius*, did not at this time broach any new hereſie, but under thoſe *Three Chapters* on which they put the viſor of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, ſought to revive the hereſie of *Neſtorius*, which before, when it came in its owne habit, was condemned: Even ſo the fift Councell needed not, neither did they condemne any new, but unmasked the old & condemned hereſie of *Neſtorius* lurking under the defence of theſe *Three Chapters*; they pulled off the viſor of *Chalcedon* from it, under which it moſt ſubtilly now ſought to inſinuate it ſelfe, and creep into the Church. And when *Gregory* ſaith, that in this fift Councell they dealt *tantummodo de perſonis*, that *tantummodo*, in his ſenſe doth not exclude all handling of the faith, not the explaning, not the corroborating of the faith, for both theſe they certainly did, and *Gregory* acknowledgeth: but it onely excludes ſuch an handling of the faith as was uſed at *Epheſus*

y *Lib. 7. Epiſt. 54.*

z *Lib. 2. Ind. 11. Epiſt. 10.*

pheſus and *Chalcedon*, by making an *Introductive* decree for condemning ſome new hereſie. The fift Councell dealt onely with perſons, without making ſuch a Decree; yet it dealt with thoſe perſons with an intent to explane and corroborate thoſe *Introductive* decrees.

19. The words of *Gregory* next following thoſe on which *Baronius* relied, doe yet more fully explane this to have beene his meaning. In the fift Synod nothing was done concerning the faith, but only the perſons; and thoſe perſons, *de quibus in Chalcedonenſi Synodo nihil continetur, concerning wch perſons nothing is contained or ſet downe in the Councell at Chalcedon.* For as there is much contained in that Councell concerning thoſe perſons, eſpecially *Ibas*, (in whoſe cauſe, and the examining therof, two [a] whole Actions are beſtowed) and yet in a favourable conſtruction, or according to *Gregory* his meaning, he might truly ſay, that nothing concerning them is contained there; to wit, nothing to condemne *Theodorus*, or the writings of *Theodoret* and *Ibas* in ſuch an expreſſe and particular manner as they are condemned in the fift Councell: Right ſo, though the fift Councell not onely handled a cauſe of faith, but publiſhed their decree as a Decree of faith; yet in a like favourable conſtruction, and according to *Gregories* meaning he might truly ſay, that nothing was done therein concerning the faith, to wit, nothing to make ſuch an *Introductive* decree for condemning a new hereſie, as was formerly made in the Councell at *Chalcedon*.

[a] *Act. 9. & 10.*

20. By all which the true meaning of *Gregory* is now by his owne explaning moſt evident. In the fift Councell nothing was done contrary to the faith, (as the malignant ſlanderers of this Councell pretended) nothing was done *de novo, to condemne any new hereſie*; nothing was done abſolutely, or without reference to theſe *Three Chapters*: all this *Gregory* truly intendeth, when he ſaith, nothing was done therein concerning the faith: but ſeeing all that was done in the Councell, was done to explane, confirme & corroberate the faith decreed at *Chalcedon*, & *Epheſus*; as *Gregory* himſelfe profeſſeth, it undoubtedly followeth, that even for this cauſe, and by *Gregories* owne teſtimonie, the queſtion here defined was a cauſe and queſtion of faith. Vpon *Gregories* words the Cardinall might well have collected, that *Vigilius* in defending the *Three Chapters*, erred not in any new hereſie, or new queſtion of faith, ſuch as was not before condemned; but that he erred not at all in a cauſe of faith, is ſo farre from the intent of *Gregory*, that out of his expreſſe words the quite contrary is certainly to be collected. For how can the Pope be ſaid not at all to erre in the faith, when by his *Apoſtolicall* Conſtitution he defendeth that cauſe of the *Three Chapters*, the defending whereof contradicteth a former definition of faith, and utterly overthroweth the holy Councell of *Epheſus* and *Chalaceon*; yea, the whole Catholike faith,

21. Neither

21. Neither muſt this ſeeme ſtrange to any, that the fift generall Councell did onely explane and confirme a former definition of faith, and made no decree to condemne any new hereſie repugnant to the faith. The like hereof in ſome other Councels may be obſerued. The Councell of *Sardica* was a generall holy Councel, as beſide [b] others the Emperor *Iuſtinian* in that his [c] Edict witneſſeth: and yet in it, [d] *nihil novi quoad fidem definitũ eſt; no new doctrine of faith was there defined*, nor any new hereſie condemned, but onely the faith decreed at *Nice* was corroborated, and confirmed. And the cauſe why the *Sardican* Councell is not reckoned in the order of generall Councels, was not that which [e] *Bellarmine* and *Binius* fancie; becauſe the *Sardican* and *Nicene* were held to be one and the ſame Councell, (for neither were they ſo indeed, being called by different Emperours, to different places, at different times, and upon different occaſions; neither were they ever by the ancient, or any of ſound judgement held for one Synod) but the true reaſon thereof was this, becauſe the *Sardicane*, though in dignity & authority it was equall to the *Nicene*, yet onely confirmed the Decree of faith formerly made at *Nice*; and made no new or *Introductive* decree, to condemne any hereſie, as did the other at *Nice*. And truly for the ſelfe ſame reaſon, the Church might, if they had pleaſed, have done the like to this fift Councell, and not have accounted it no more than they did the *Sardicane*, in a diſtinct number; but onely eſteemed it a Councell *corroborative* of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, as that at *Sardica* was of the *Nicene* Councell, which ſome Churches alſo did, as by the 14. Councell at [f] *Toledo*, held a little after the ſixt generall, appeareth; wherein this fift being for that cauſe omitted; the ſixt, held under *Conſtantinus Pogonatus*, is reckoned as the fift, or next Councell to that at *Chalcedõ*. But for as much as this cauſe about the *Three Chapters* had bred ſo long, and ſo exceeding great trouble in the Church; and becauſe the explanation of the faith made in this fift Councell upon occaſion of thoſe Chapters, was ſo exact, that it did in a manner equal any former decree of faith, and benefit the whole Church as much as any had done: it pleaſed the Church for theſe reaſons, with one conſent, declared firſt in the ſixt [g] Councell; and then in the 2. [h] *Nicene*, and divers other after it, to account this for the fift, and ranke it as it well deſerveth, in the number of holy and golden generall Councels.

22. It now I hope clearely appeareth how unjuſtly the Cardinall pretends the words of Pope *Gregory*, as denying this to be at all any cauſe of faith; whereas not onely by the Emperour, by the fift Councell, by the defenders as well as the condemners of theſe Chapters; by ſuceeding generall Councels; by Popes, even Pope *Gregory* among the reſt; by the Catholike Church, and conſent thereof untill their Laterane Synod; but even by their owne writers, Cardinall *Bellarmine*, *Sanders*, yea, by *Baronius* himſelfe, it

b *Socr. lib. 2. ca. 16. Ex pluribus quam 35 provincijs collecta. Athan. Epiſt. ad ſolit. vitam agent. pa. 225.*
c *Ab univerſali Sardicenſi Synodo. Iuſt. Edict. § Quod autem.*
d *Bin. Not. in Conc. Sard. § Cum igitur. & Bell. lib. 2. de Rom. Pont. chap. 25 § Tertia.*
e *Locu citat.*
f *Can. 6. & 7.*
g *Act. 15. pa. 80. Sãctas & univerſales quinq; Synodos, & ſuper has & quintæ Synodi.*
h *Can. 1.*

it is evidently proved ſo nearely to concerne the faith, that to defend theſe Chapters (which *Vigilius* did) is to enervate and overthrow; and to condemne them (which the Councell did) is to uphold and confirme the Holy Catholike faith. And although this alone (if I ſhould ſay no more) were ſufficient to oppoſe to this firſt Evaſion of *Baronius*; yet, that both the truth hereof may more fully and further appeare; and that the moſt vile and ſhameleſſe dealing of *Baronius* in this cauſe, ſuch, as I thinke few heretikes have ever parallel'd, may be palpable unto all; To that which hitherto we have ſpoken in generall concerning all theſe *Three Chapters*, I purpoſe now to adde a particular conſideration of each of them by it ſelfe; whereby it will be evident, that every one of theſe Chapters doth ſo directly concerne the faith; that the defence of any one of them, but eſpecially of the two laſt, is an oppugnation, yea, an abnegation of the whole Chriſtian faith.

CAP. VI.

That the firſt reaſon of Vigilius *touching the* firſt Chapter, *why* Theodorus *of Mopſveſtia ought not to bee condemned,* becauſe none after their death ought *noviter* to be condemned, *concernes the faith, and is hereticall.*

1. IN the firſt Chapter, wherein *Vigilius* defendeth that *Theodorus* of Mopſveſtia, being long before dead, ought not to bee condemned for an heretike; the Popes ſentence relyeth on three reaſons, the examination whereof, wil both open the whole cauſe concerning *this Chapter*, and manifeſt the foule errors of *Vigilius*, as well doctrinall, as perſonall, as well concerning the faith, as the fact.

2. His firſt reaſon is drawne from a generall poſition, which *Vigilius* taketh as a Maxime, or doctrinall principle in divinitie. *Nulli* [a] *licere noviter aliquid de mortuorum judicare perſonis; It is lawfull to condemne none after their death,* who were not in their life time condemned; and therefore not *Theodorus*. That *Theodorus* in his life time was not condemned, *Vigilius* proveth not, but preſuppoſeth; nor doe I in that diſſent from him; for although that teſtimony of *Leontius* [b] be *exceeding partiall and untrue*, where he ſaith, that *Theodorus* and *Diodorus*, *in pretio habiti mortem oppetiere; died in honour*; neither did [c] any, *while they lived reprove any of their ſayings*: yet are there divers other inducements to perſwade, that *Theodorus* was not in his life time, by any publike judgement of the Church, either declared, or condemned for an heretike: for beſides that neither *Cyrill*, nor *Proclus*, nor the fift generall Councell, doe mention any ſuch matter, the words of *Cyrill*

a *Conſt. Vigil. ep. Bar. an. 553. nu. 179.*

b *Leon. lib. de ſect. Act. 4.*

c *Vivis quidem ipſis cur nemo contradixerat, falſum ideo, &c. Ibid.*

Cyrill doe plainly import the contrary. The Epheſine Synod, ſaith [d] he, *forbare in particular, and by name, to anuthematize* Theorus, which they did *diſpenſativè, by a certaine diſpenſation,* indulgence, or connivence, becauſe divers held him in great eſtimatiõ, or account: what needed either any ſuch diſpenſation, or forbearance, had he in his life time beene publikely condemned for hereſie? Againe, the Church of Mopſveſtia, where hee was Biſhop, for divers yeares after his death, retained his name *in* [e] *Diplicis*, that is, *in their Eccleſiaſticall tables*, making a thankfull commemoration of him, as of other Catholikes in their Liturgie; which, had he beene in his life time condemned for an heretike, they would not have done. Laſtly, what needed the defenders of the *Three Chapters* have beene ſo ſcrupulous, to condemne him being dead, had he in his life time beene before condemned? Or how could this have given occaſion of this controverſie, whether a dead man might *Noviter* be condemned, if *Theodorus* had not beene *noviter* condemned when he was dead.

d *Cyril. epiſt. ad Proc. in Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 550, 551.*

e *Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 552. & ſeq. in act. Synod. Mopſv.*

3. Wherefore this particular being agreed upon, that *Theodorus* was not before, but after his death condemned, the whole doubt now reſteth in the *Theſis, whether a dead man may* Noviter *be cõdemned.* Now that this is no perſonall, but meerly a dogmaticall cauſe, and controverſie of faith, is ſo evident, that it might be a wonder that *Baronius*, or any other, ſhould ſo much as doubt thereof, unleſſe the Apoſtle had foretold, that *becauſe men* [f] *doe not receive the love of the truth; therefore God doth ſend unto them ſtrong deluſions, that they may beleeve lyes.* Certaine it is that Pope *Vigilius*, held this for no other, but a doctrine of faith; for he ſets it downe as a [g] Definition, or *Conſtitution* of his predeceſſors, decreed by the *Apoſtolike* See: particularly by Pope *Leo*, and *Gelaſius*; and ſo decreed by them, as warranted, and taught by the Scriptures; for out of thoſe words, What ſoever ye binde, or looſe upon earth, Pope *Gelaſius* [h] *collecteth*, and *Vigilius* conſenteth unto him, that ſuch as are not upon earth, or among the living, *hos non humano, ſed ſuo Deus judicio reſervavit; God hath exempted them from humane, and reſerved them to his owne judgement: nec audet Eccleſia, nor dare the Church challenge to it ſelfe the judgement of ſuch.* As the Pope, ſo alſo the holy generall Councell tooke this for no other, than a queſtion of faith; for they plainly profeſſe, even in their Synodall reſolution, that their decree concerning dead men, that they may *bee Noviter condemned*; is not onely an Eccleſiaſticall [i] tradition, but an *Apoſtolicall* doctrine alſo, warranted by the texts, and teſtimonies of the holy Scriptures. To which purpoſe alledging divers places of Scripture, they adde theſe words; It is many wayes manifeſt, that they who affirme this, [that men after their death may not *Noviter be condemned,*] *nullam curam Dei judicatorum faciunt, nec Apoſtolicarum pronunciationum, nec paternarum traditionum*; that *ſuch have no regard either to the word of God, or the Apoſtles doctrine, or the tra-*

f 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 10, 11.

g *Perſpeximus ſi quid de his prædeceſſores noſtri decreverint. Vig. Conſt. loc. citat. nu.* 176. *Hujus cauſæ formam veneranda prædeceſſorum noſtrorum conſtituta, nobis apertiſſime tradiderunt. Ibid. Idem regulariæ Apoſtolicæ ſedis definiunt conſtituta. Ibid. nu.* 179.

h *Ibid. nu.* 177.

i *Licet cognoſceremus Eccleſiaſticam de impiis traditionem. Coll.* 8. *pa.* 585. *a.*

dition of the Fathers. So the whole Councell judging, and decreeing Pope *Vigilius* to be guilty of all theſe.

4. Now when both the Pope on the one ſide, and the whole generall Councell on the other; that is, both the defenders, and condemners of *this Chapter* profeſſe it to be a doctrine taught in the Scripture, and therefore undoubtedly to be a cauſe of faith; what inſolency was it in *Baronius* to contradict them both, and, againſt that truth, wherein they both agree, to deny *this Chapter* to be a cauſe of faith? or ſeeing it is cleere, both by the Pope, and Councell, that the reſolution of this queſtion is ſet downe in Scripture, what elſe can bee thought of *Baronius* denying either the one, or the other part, to bee a cauſe, or aſſertion of faith, but that with him the doctrines defined, and ſet down in Scriptures, are no doctrines or aſſertions of faith, at leaſt, not of the *Cardinals* faith?

5. Seeing now this is a cauſe of faith, and in this cauſe of faith, the Pope, and generall Councell are at variance; either of them challenge the Scripture, as conſonant to his, and repugnant to the oppoſite aſſertion; what equall and unpartiall umpire may be found to judge in this matter? *Audito Eccleſiæ nomine hoſtis expalluit*, ſaith their vaine, and vaunting [k] Braggadochio; *Haſt thou appealed to the Church? to the Church, and judgement thereof ſhalt thou goe*; at the name of which, we are ſo farre from being daunted, or appaled, that with great confidence, and aſſurance of victory, we provoke unto it. k *Camp. Rat. 3.*

6. But where may we heare the voyce, and judgement of the Church? out of doubt either in the writings of the Fathers, or provinciall Synods, or in generall Councels; & in which of theſe ſoever the Church ſpeake, her ſentence is for us, and our ſide. Her voyce is but ſoft & ſtil in the writings of ſingle Fathers; the Church whiſpereth rather then ſpeaketh in them; and yet even in them ſhee ſpeaketh this truth very diſtinctly, and audibly. Heare Saint [l] *Auſten*, who entreating of *Cæcilianus*, about an hundreth yeares after his death, ſaith; *If as yet they could prove him to have beene guilty of thoſe crimes*, which were by the Donatiſts objected unto him, *ipſum jam mortuum anathematizaremus, I and all Catholikes would even now accurſe him though dead*, though never condemned before, nor in his life time. Againe, [m] In this our communion, if there have beene any *Traditores*, or deliverers of the Bible to be burned in time of perſecution, when thou ſhalt *demonſtrate* or prove them to have beene ſuch, *& corde & carne mortuos deteſtabor*. Heare Pope [n] *Pelagius*, who both himſelfe fully aſſenteth herein to Saint *Auſten*, and teſtifieth the aſſent of Pope *Leo*, in this manner; *Quis neſciat, who knoweth not* that the doctrine of *Leo* is conſonant to Saint *Auſten*. Heare [o] S. *Cyrill*, who ſpeaking of heretikes, ſaith, *Evitandi ſunt, ſive in vivis, ſive in mortuis; they are to bee avoyded, whether they bee dead, or living*.

l *Epiſt. ad Bonif. quæ citatur Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 548. b.*

m *Aug. lib. 3. Cont. Creſc. ca. 35.*

n *Pelag. 2. Epiſt. 7. § In his autem.*

o *Cyr. lib. cont. Theod. cit. à Conc. 5. Collat. 8. pa. 585. a.*

7. The Church ſpeakes yet ſomewhat louder, in the united judgement of *Provinciall* Synods. In an [p] *Africane* Councell *it was proved, how certaine Biſhops at their death had bequeathed their goods to heretikes*; whereupon *ſtatuerunt*, the *Biſhops in that Synod decreed, ut poſt mortem anathemati ſubjiciantur*; *that ſuch ſhould bee accurſed, even after their death*; and this *Sextilianus* an *Africane* Biſhop teſtifieth upon his owne certaine knowledge. The judgement of the Romane Church is to this purpoſe moſt pregnant. About ſome twenty yeares before this fift Councell, *Dioſcorus* was choſen Biſhop of Rome; but ſhortly after dying, *eum & poſt mortem anathematizavit Romana Eccleſia*; *the Romane Church accurſed him even after he was dead*, although hee had not offended in the faith, (but in ſome pecuniary or Symoniacall crime) *Et hoc ſciunt omnes, qui degunt Romæ*; *and they all who live at Rome, know this to have beene done againſt him after his death*; they eſpecially who are in eminent place, who alſo continued in the communion with *Dioſcorus* untill hee dyed, as after [q] *Iuſtinian*, *Benignus* [r] Biſhop of Heraclea; and after them both the fift Councell [s] teſtifieth. In this very cauſe of *Theodorus* there was a Synod held in *Armenia*, by *Rambulas* [t] Biſhop of Edeſſa, *Acatius*, and others, wherein, both themſelves condemned *Theodorus*, (though dead) and in their letters to *Proclus* exhort [u] him to doe the like.

8. But this voyce of the Church ſounds like a mighty thunder in the conſenting judgement of generall Councels. In the ſixt, [x] Pope *Honorius*, who in his life time had not been, was now about threeſcore yeares after his death, convicted to bee an heretike; and then *noviter condemned, and anathematized by the whole Councell*. The ſame ſentence of *Anathema* was confirmed, and againe denounced againſt him in the ſecond [y] *Nicene*; and in the other under [z] *Hadrian*, which they account to be the ſeventh and eighth generall Councels. In the Councell of *Chalcedon*, *Domnus* [a] *Biſhop of Antioch, was after his death condemned*. In the holy *Epheſine* Councell was this very *Theodorus of Mopſveſtia*, *after his death condemned*, as Pope *Pelagius* [b] expreſly teſtifieth. The like to have beene done againſt *Macedonius*, by the fift Councell at *Conſtantinople*, *Iuſtinian* [c] declareth. Before that, was the ſame done by the Councell at *Sardica*; for when ſome of thoſe, who had ſubſcribed to the *Nicene* faith, returned to *Arianiſme*, *alij quidem* [d] *vivi, alij autem poſt mortem anathematizati ſunt à Damaſo Papa, & ab univerſali Sardicenſi Synodo*; *they were anathematized, ſome while they lived, others after their death, by Pope Damaſus, and by the generall Councell at Sardica*, as witneſſeth *Athanaſius*. With ſuch an uniforme conſent doe all theſe Councels teach this, and teach it, not as any *novell* doctrine, but as a truth ſucceſſively from age to age, even from the Apoſtles time delivered unto them; by warrant of which *Apoſtolical* tradition *Valentinus*, *Martian*, *Baſilides*, *à nulla Synodo* [e] *anathematizati, being by no Synod in their life time condemned, were after their death accurſed by the Church of God.*

9. And

p Citatur in Conc. 5. Coll 5. pa. 548. a.

q Iuſt. Edict. § Invenimus.
r Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 549. a.
s Coll. 8. pa. 585. b.
t Bar. an. 435. nu. 4

u Petimus quatenus fiat unitas veſtra contra Theodorum, & ſacrilega Dogmata ejus. In Libell. Presbyt. Armē. ad Procl. in Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa 542. b.

x Act. 12. 13, 18.
y Act. 7. in Epiſtola 2. Synod. & Can. 1.
z Honorius poſt mortem ab Orientis Epiſcopis anathemate eſt affectus. Conc. 8. Act. 7. pa. 891. b.
a Edict. Juſtin. § Quod autem. & Conc. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 575. b.
b Pelag. 2. Epiſt. § In his.
c Sancta Dei Eccleſia & poſt mortem Macedonium anathematizavit. Iuſt. Edict. § Quod
d Ibidem.

e Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 549. a.

9. And yet if none of all these particulars could bee produced, seeing the doctrine of the faith decreed in this fift Councell, (one part whereof is this *of condemning the dead*) is consonant to all the former, and confirmed by all succeeding Councels, (as we did before demonstrate) nor Councels only, but approved by all Popes, and Bishops, from *Gregory* the first, to *Leo* the tenth, yea, by all Catholikes whatsoever, who all, by approving this fift Councell, consent in this truth; Seeing all these, that is, the whole Catholike Church, for 1500 yeares, with one consenting voyce, sound out, like a multitude of mighty waters, this Catholike truth, which *Vigilius* oppugneth, *that one may after his death be* noviter *condemned*, and sound it as a doctrine of the Catholike faith, and even thereby sound out Pope *Vigilius to have held, yea, to have defined heresie; and all, who defend Vigilius, to bee hereticall*; I do nothing doubt, but if ever you did, or can, you doe now most distinctly heare the voyce of the Church, even of that Church, of which their Romane Rabsecha vaunteth, that we are marvellously affrighted at the very name thereof.

10. May I now intreate, that as you have heard the Church, so you would be pleased to heare what the Cardinall doth say of this matter. After this part of *Vigilius* decree, he sets a memorable *glosse* upon the Popes text. *Hic adverte, Note here*, saith the *Cardinall*, that [f] this assertion of *Vigilius* (*that dead men ought not to be condemned*) *is not so generally received as it is set downe by him*. A worthy note indeed out of a Cardinals mouth; *Papa hic non tenetur*. But I pray you, by whom is it not received? The Cardinall answers, not by the holy Church; *the holy Church* [g] *doth practise the contrary unto it*. What? the holy Church not receive the dogmaticall and *Apostolicall* assertion of the holy Pope? not that assertion which his *Holinesse* decreeth to be taught by Scripture, to be a *Constitution*, a rule, a definition of the holy Apostolike See? No truly; The holy Church for all that, receives not this assertion, saith the Cardinall. And the Cardinall was to blame to use such a palpable μειωσις. The Church receiveth it not: hee might, and he should have said; *The holy Church rejecteth, condemneth, and accurseth this Cathedrall assertion of the Pope, and all that defend it: nor the Church onely of that one age wherein Vigilius lived, but the Catholike Church of all ages, speaking by the mouthes of al generall Councels, of Fathers, of Popes, of al Catholikes, this holy Church condemneth and accurseth the assertion of Pope* Vigilius. The Cardinall was too diminutive in his extenuations, when he spake so faintly, The holy Church doth not so generally receive it.

[f] Bar. an. 553. nu. 185.

[g] Ejusmodi hominē jure damnare post mortem sancta consuevit Ecclesia. Bar. ibid.

11. Let us beare with the Cardinals tendernesse of heart: the Popes sores must not be touched, but with soft, and tender hands. Seeing the Cardinall hath brought the Pope, and the holy Church to be at ods, and at an unreconciliable contradiction; the Pope denying, the Church affirming, that *a man after his death may* noviter *be condemned*, it is well worth the labour to

examine, whether part the Cardinall himſelfe will take in this quarreil; you may be ſure, the choyce on either part was very hard for him: he hath here a worſe matter than a wolfe by the eares. This is *dignus vindice nodus*, a point which will trie the Cardinals art, wiſdome, piety, conſtancy, and faire dealing: And in very deed, he hath herein plaid *Sir Politike would be*, above the degree of commendation. The Cardinall is a man of peace, hee loves not to diſpleaſe either the Pope, or the Church; he knew, that to provoke either of them, would bring an armie of waſpes about his eares; and therfore very gravely, wiſely, and diſcreetly he takes part with them both: and though their aſſertions bee directly contradictory, he holds them both to be true, and takes up an hymne of *Omnia bene* to them both.

12. Firſt, he ſheweth that the Church ſaith right, in this manner: *Although* [h] *it be proved, that one dyed in the peace of the Church, and yet it doe afterwards appeare, that in his writings he defended a condemned hereſie, and continuing in that hereſie died therein; and but diſſemblingly communicate with the Church, the holy Church uſeth to condemne ſuch a man, jure, even by right.* Having ſaid as much as can bee wiſhed, on the Churches part, the Cardinall will now teach, *that the Pope alſo ſaith right*, in this manner: *Pope Vigilius* [i] *had many worthy reaſons for his defence of the Three Chapters, by his Conſtitution; and among thoſe worthy reaſons this is one: for if this were once admitted, that a man who dyeth in the communion of the Church, might after his death be condemned; pateret oſtium, this would open ſuch a gap, that every eccleſiaſticall writer, though hee dyed in the Catholike Communion, may yet after his death, out of his writings be condemned for an heretike.* Thus *Baronius*.

h Bar. an. 553. nu. 185.

i Bar. an. 553. nu. 233.

13. O what a *golden* and bleſſed age was this, that brought forth ſuch a Cardinall! The Church decreeth, that a man after his death, *may* noviter *be condemned* for an heretike; and it decreeth aright: The Pope decreeth the quite contrary, *that no man after his death may* noviter *be condemned* for an heretike; and hee alſo decreeth aright, and with good reaſon. So both the *Church ſaith well*, & *the Pope ſaith well*; & you can ſay no leſſe then, *Et vitula tu dignus, & hic:* or becauſe the Cardinall ſaith *better* than they both; and, what *Iupiter* himſelfe could never doe, makes *two contradictory ſayings* to be both true, and both ſaid well; heo beſt deſerveth, let him have all the prize, *Vitula tu dignus utrâque.*

14. I told you before, and this enſuing treatiſe will make it as cleare as the Sunne, that *Baronius* having once loſt the path, & forſaken that truth, where only ſure footing was to be found, wandreth up and downe, in and out in this cauſe, as in a wilderneſſe, treading on nothing but thornes, wherewith feeling himſelfe prickt, he skips hither and thither for ſuecour, but ſtill lights on briars and brambles, which doe not onely gall, but ſo intangle him, that by no meanes he can ever extricate, or unwinde himſelfe;

himſelfe; for if one liſted to make ſport with the Cardinall, it clearly and certainly followeth, that if the Church *ſay true*, then the Pope ſaying the contrary, doth *ſay untrue*. Againe, if the Pope *ſay true*, then the Church ſaying the contrary, doth *ſay untrue*; and then upon the Cardinals *ſaying that they both ſay true*, it certainly followeth, that neither of them both ſay true, and yet further, that both of them, ſay both *true and untrue*, and yet that neither of them both ſaith either *truth, or untruth*.

15. But leaving the Cardinall in theſe bryars, ſeeing by the upright, and unpartiall judgement of the whole Catholike Church of all ages, we have proved the Popes decree herein to be erroneous, and (becauſe it is in *a cauſe of faith*) heretical, let us a little examine the two reaſons on which *Vigilius* groundeth this his aſſertion: The former is taken from thoſe words of our Saviour,[k] *whatſoever ye binde on earth*, whence, as you have ſeene, *Vigilius*, and, as he ſaith, *Gelaſius* alſo collecteth, that ſuch as are not on earth or alive, cannot be judged by the Church.

k *Matth* 18. 18.

16. The anſwer is not hard; our Saviours words, being well conſidered, are ſo farre from concluding, what *Vigilius* or *Gelaſius*, or both, doe thence collect, that they clearly and certainly doe enforce the quite contrary; for he ſaid not, Whatſoever yee binde, or looſe, concerning thoſe that are on earth, or living; in which ſenſe *Vigilius* tooke them: but, Whatſoever concerning either the *living* or *dead*, ye my *Apoſtles*, and your *ſucceſſors* being upon earth, or during your life time, ſhall binde or looſe, the ſame according to your cenſure here paſſed upon earth, ſhall by my authority bee ratified in heaven. The reſtrictive termes [*upon earth*] are referred to the parties, who doe binde, or looſe; not to the parties, who are bound, or looſed. The generall terme [*whatſoever*] is referred to the parties who are bound, or looſed, whether they be dead, or alive, not to the parties who binde or looſe, who are onely alive, and upon earth. Nor doth our Saviour ſay, Whatſoever yee ſeeme to binde or looſe here upon earth, ſhall bee bound or looſed in heaven; for, (*eccleſia clave errante*) no cenſure doth, or can either binde, or looſe, either the quicke or the dead: but he ſaith, Whatſoever ye doe binde or looſe, if the party be once truly and really bound, or looſed, by you that are upon earth, it ſhall ſtand firme, and bee ratified by my ſelfe in heaven. So the parties who doe binde, or looſe, are the *Apoſtles*, and their *ſucceſſors* onely while they are upon earth: the parties who are bound, or looſed, are any whoſoever whether *alive* or *dead*; the partie who ratifieth their act in binding and looſing, is *Chriſt* himſelfe in heaven; For I ſay unto you, whatſoever ye binde on earth, ſhall be bound in heaven, and whatſoever yee looſe on earth, ſhall be looſed in heaven.

17. This expoſition is clearly warranted by the judgement of the whole catholike Church, which, as we have before declared, both beleeved, taught, and practiſed this authority of binding,

and looſing, not onely upon the living, but upon the dead alſo. Of their binding the nocent, wee have alleaged before abundance of examples: for their looſing the innocent, that one of *Flavianus* is ſufficient. *The Epheſine* [l] *latrocinie adjudged and condemned Flavianus a moſt holy and Catholike Biſhop, for an Hereticke; under the cenſure of that generall Councel Flavianus died, nay was martyred* [m] *by them:* The holy Councell at *Chalcedon* after the death of *Flavianus*, looſed that band, wherwith the latrocinious conſpirators at Epheſus, thought they had faſt tyed him, but becauſe their *key did erre*, they did not in truth. They honored and proclamed *Flavianus* for a *Saint and Martyr* [n], whom the faction of *Dioſcorus* had murdered for an heretike: the holy Councell feared not to looſe him, becauſe he was *dead*, & their power to binde, or looſe, was onely towards thoſe that are upon the earth, or living. By which example, and warrantie of that holy Councell, our Church of latter time, imitating the religious pietie of thoſe ancient Biſhops, reſtored to their *priſtine* [o] *dignitie and honor thoſe reverend Martyrs, two Flaviani in their age, Bucer and Fagius after their death*; when a worſe then that Epheſine conſpiracy had not onely with an *erring key bound*, but even *burned* them to aſhes. Now it is rightly obſerved by *Iuſtinian* [p], *that if the Church may after their death, reſtore ſuch as being unjuſtly condemned, and falſly ſuppoſed to be bound, died in their innocency, and ſincerity of faith: it may alſo by the very ſame reaſon, condemne, and anathematize ſuch after their death, who died in their impiety or hereſie*, being charitably perhaps but falſly ſuppoſed, to have died in the communion of the Catholike Church.

18. And truely, whether ſoever of theſe cenſures; either of *binding*, or *looſing*, the Church uſeth towards the dead, as they both are warranted by the words of Chriſt, and judgement of the Church, ſo in doing either of both, they performe an acceptable ſervice to God, and an holy duty to the Church of God. For as wee profeſſe in our Creed to beleeve the *Communion* of *Saints*, which in part conſiſteth in loving, praiſing, and imitating all ſuch as we know, either now to live, or heretofore to have dyed in the faith, or for the faith of Chriſt: ſo doe wee by the ſame Article of our Creed, renounce all *communion* with whatſoever *hereticks*, either *dead* or *alive*, and therefore though in their life time, they had never beene condemned for ſuch, but honored as the ſervants of God, under whoſe livery they hide their hereſies, and impieties; yet ſo ſoone as ever they ſhall bee manifeſted to have beene indeed, and to have died heretikes, we ought forthwith to forſake all communion with them, not love them, nor ſpeake well of them, much leſſe imitate them; but as Saint *Auſten* ſaith he would doe of *Caſilianus*, even after their death, *corde & carne anathematizare*, not making them accurſed; (For that the Church cannot do, and themſelves have done that already) but declaring them to be accurſed, & in truth excluded from

l *Act. conciliab. Epheſ. citata in actis Conc. Chalc. Act. 1. pa. 57. b.*

m *Cæſus Flavianus dolore plagarum migravit ad Dominum. lib ca. 12.*

n *Quæ (Synodus Chalc.) Flaviano palmam mortis tribuit glorioſæ. Edict. Valen. & Mart. in Chalced. Conc. Act. 4. pa. 86. a. & Flavianus injuſte quidem in vita condemnatus, juſte poſt mortem revocatus eſt a B. Leone et ſancta Synodo Chalcedonenſi. Iuſt. edict. §. Invenimus.*

o *Hiſt. combuſtionis Buceri et Fagij et reſtitutionis eorum.*

p *Si non oporteret anathematizari poſt mortem eos qui in ſua impietate mortui ſunt, oportebat nec eos qui injuſte condemnati ſunt patres poſt mortem revocari. Iuſt. edict. prope finem.*

from the ſociety of God, & Gods Church; and to be ſuch though dead, as with whom we can have no more cõmunion, then hath light with darkneſſe, faith with hereſie, God and Beliall; nay we ſhould wiſh that if it were poſſible, there might be ſuch an antipathie, and diſunion betwixt us and them, as is ſaid to have been betwixt *Eteocles* [q], and *Polinices*, that even our dead bones, and aſhes, might leape from theirs, nor ſleepe in one Church, nor one earth with them, from whom one day they ſhall be eternally ſevered, by a wall of immortality and immortall glory.

q *Impoſitis eorum cadaveribus eidem rogo, flammam ſe diviſiſſe traditur, vid. Stat. in Theb.*

19. *Vigilius* his ſecond reaſon is taken from the rules, decrees and *Conſtitutions* [r] of their *Apoſtolicke* See, by name of Pope *Leo*, & *Gelaſius*, both whõ *Vigilius* ſaith to have defined this, that *a dead man might not noviter be condemned*: was it not enough for *Vigilius*, that himſelfe was *hereticall* herein, unleſſe he drew his predeceſſors alſo into the ſame crime, of defending, yea diefining hereſies? How much better had it beſeemed him, to have covered ſuch hereticall blemiſhes of their *Apoſtolike* See, and of ſo famous Biſhops as *Leo* and *Gelaſius* were, if not with a lappe of his robe, as the good *Emperour* would, yet at leaſt with ſilence and oblivion.

r *Idem regulariter Apoſtolicæ ſedis definiunt conſtituta. Vigil. loc. citat. nu. 179.*

20. And yet for all this, if *Vigilius* and the defenders of his *infallibility*, will give me leave, I am for my owne part willing to thinke better, and more favourably of *Leo*, and *Gelaſius*, in this matter: ſpecially of *Leo*, whoſe authority, when ſome defenders of the *three Chapters* objected [s] to Pope *Pelagius*, *as according with them, Pelagius replyed not onely that hee could no where remember any ſuch thing in the bookes of Leo, but that Leo indeed taught the quite contrary*, as conſenting [t] wholly with Saint *Auſten, who profeſſed, that he would anathematize Cæcilianus after his death, if it could appeare that he were guilty of thoſe crimes.* Which teſtimony of *Pelagius* as it fully cleareth *Leo* of this hereſie, ſo doth it manifeſt how unjuſtly *Vigilius* pretendeth his conſent with him in this cauſe; yea and the words of *Leo*, which hee citeth, doe declare no leſſe. In that Epiſtle [u] *Leo* intreating of thoſe *who by the juſt cenſure of the Church, were excommunicated, or who did not performe the acts required in repentance*, ſaith, If any of them die before hee obtaine remiſſion, *quod manens in corpore non receperit, conſequi exutus carne non poterit, hee cannot obtaine that (to wit, remiſſion of his fault) being dead, which before his death he had not received:* And upon theſe follow the words cited by *Vigilius*. Neither is it needfull that we ſhold fift the merits or acts of them, *qui ſic obierunt, who ſo die, ſeeing our Lord hath reſerved to his juſtice, what the prieſtly miniſterie could not performe, (to wit, the looſing of that band of cenſure or of ſinne, under which they dyed.)* Thus *Leo*, who denieth not that men after their death may be condemned, but that any who in his life time is not, may after his death bee pardoned; Hee ſpeakes not of ſuch as have not beene in their life time condemned, of which onely *Vigilius* entreateth, but of ſuch, who being unpenitent

s *Præmiſſis dicentes, doctrina veſtræ reverendæ ſedis eſt, per B. Leonem ſucceſſoreſq; ejus, mortuum ab hominibus damnari nullatenus oportere. Pelag. 2. Epiſt. 7. § In his.*

t *Quis neſcit quod ejuſdem Leonis & B. Auguſtini prædicatio contradicat, ibid*

u *Leo Epiſt. 91.*

unpenitent, or condemned by the Church, die in their ſin, or under that juſt cenſure, & therefore in the ſtate of condemnation: So neither doe the words of *Leo* ſignifie any ſuch thing, as *Vigilius* by them intended to prove: and Pope *Pelagius* aſſureth us, that *Leo* taught the quite contrary to that, which out of *Leo*, *Vigilius* in vaine laboureth to prove.

21. The very like conſtruction is to bee given of the words of *Gelaſius* in both the places cited out of him by *Vigilius*. In the former,[x] entreating of *Acatius*, he thus ſaith, *Let no man perſwade you that Acatius is freed from the crime of his prevarication*; for after he had falne into that wickedneſſe, and deſerved to be excluded, and that, *jure*, by right, from the *Apoſtolike* communion, *in hac eâdem perſiſtens damnatione defunctus eſt, hee perſiſting in this condemnation dyed; Abſolution cannot bee now granted unto him being dead, which he neither deſired, nor deſerved while he lived:* for it was ſaid to the Apoſtles, *Whatſoever yee binde on earth:* But of him (theſe are the words cited by *Vigilius*) *who is now under Gods judgement*, (that is, who is dead in this ſort) *it is not lawfull for us to decree ought elſe, but that, in quo eum ſupremus dies invenit, wherein hee was found at the time of his death.* So *Gelaſius*. In which words it is evident that hee ſpeakes not (as *Vigilius* doth) of ſuch as in their life time were not condemned, nor denieth hee that ſuch may after their death (when their hereſie is diſcovered) be condemned, but of ſuch as being in their life time juſtly condemned, dye impenitent in that eſtate, and of ſuch he denyeth, that after their death they can be abſolved. A truth ſo cleare, that *Binius* ſets this marginall note upon it, *Qui impœnitens mortuus eſt excommunicatus, poſt mortem non poteſt abſolvi; He who dieth impenitent under the cenſure of excommunication, cannot after his death bee abſolved.* And *Gelaſius* himſelfe often repeateth the ſame moſt clearly, in his *Commonitorium* to *Fauſtus*: We reade ſaith he[y], *that Chriſt raiſed up ſome from the dead, but we never reade, that he forgave, or abſolved any who were impenitent when they dyed:* and this power he gave to *Peter*, Whatſoever thou ſhalt binde on earth: *on earth* ſaith he, *nam in hac ligatione defunctum nuſquam dixit abſolvi*; For *Chriſt never ſaid that any who dyed being ſo bound ſhould be looſed.*

22. The ſame is his meaning alſo in the other place[z] alleaged by *Vigilius*; In it he intreateth of *Vitalis* and *Miſenus*, *who being the Popes Legates, had communicated with Acatius, and other hereticall ſectaries, and were for that cauſe both of them excommunicated by Pope Felix the next predeceſſor of Gelaſius; Miſenus repenting was received into the communion of the Church: Vitalis remaining impenitent died under that juſt cenſure:* when ſome of *Vitalis* friends deſired the like abſolution for *Vitalis* being dead[a], *Gelaſius* utterly refuſed to grant it, and calling a Romane Synode, it was declared in it; *That Miſenus ought in right to be looſed, but not Vitalis, whom, as they profeſſed, they gladly would, but by reaſon of his owne impenitency wherein he dyed, they could not helpe, nor abſolve; but*

x *Gelaſ. Epiſt.* 11.

y *Gelaſ. Epiſt.* 4.

z *Epiſt. Synodalis Gelaſij, & Synod. Rom.* 2. *p.* 268. *b.*

a *Nos etiam mortuis veniam præſtare depoſcunt. ibid.*

but must leave him (which are the words on which *Vigilius* relyeth) *to the judgement of God, it being impossible for them to absolve him being dead*, seeing it is said, Whatsoever ye shall binde upon earth: such then *as are not upon earth, God hath reserved them not to mans, but to his owne judgement*; Nor dare the Church challenge this unto it: So *Gelasius* and the whole Romane Synode: who doe not herein generally deny, that any without exception may bee judged being dead, for then they should condemne besides many other, the holy Councell of *Chalcedon*, which absolved *Flavianus*, and bound or condemned *Domnus*, and both after their deaths: but limiting their speach to the present matter which they handled, they teach that none who are dead (to wit in such state as *Vitalis* dyed, excommunicated and impenitent,) no such can after their death be judged (to wit in such sort as the favourers of *Vitalis* would have had him adjudged, that is, absolved or loosed after his death from that censure:) and that the words of our Saviour doe forcibly conclude, seeing whatsoever is bound upon earth is also bound in heaven, and seeing such as die in that just bond of the Church, are indeed reserved to the onely judgement of God, the Church can pronounce no other, nor milder sentence, then it hath already passed of them. That none at all after their death may be condemned by the Church, *Gelasius* saith not, and that is the hereticall position which *Vigilius* should out of *Gelasius*, but doth not prove: That none who at their death are justly bound by the Church, and dye impenitent therein, can after their death be loosed by the Church, is a catholike truth, which *Gelasius* teacheth, and we all professe, this *Vigilius* firmly by *Gelasius* doth, but should not prove.

23. So willing am I to quit Pope *Leo* and *Gelasius* from that hereticall doctrine wherewith *Vigilius* by his *Apostolicall* decree hath not onely himselfe eternally blemished the Romane See, but laboureth also to fasten that heresie, as an ancient and hereditarie doctrine from the time of *Leo* unto their See. If this my indeavour, for the honor of *Leo* and *Gelasius* be not accepted by them, I must returne a conditionall and shorter, but more unpleasing answer to this second reason of *Vigilius*, relying on their authority, and that is this, If *Leo* and *Gelasius* truely and indeed taught the same with *Vigilius*, that none after their death may *noviter* be condemned, then were they also, as *Vigilius*, by the consenting judgement of the catholike Church, hereticall: If they did not indeed teach this doctrine, then is *Vigilius* not only erroneous in faith, both decreeing himselfe, and judging them to have decreed heresie, but slanderous also, falsly imputing so great a crime as is heresie, to so ancient & famous Popes aswere *Gelasius* and *Leo*: And so whether they taught this doctrine, or taught it not, this second reason of *Vigilius* is of no worth at all; proving nothing else, but either them to be hereticall, if *Vigilius* say true; or himselfe to be a slanderer, if he say untrue.

24. Now

24. Now after the reaſons of *Vigilius* fully refuted, in ſtead of a concluſion, I will adde one ſhort conſideration to all that hath beene ſaid, That this poſition decreed by *Vigilius* is ſuch, as doth not onely condemne the catholike church, that is, all the oppugners of it, but even *Vigilius* himſelfe, and all who defend it. Say you, that a dead man may not *noviter* be condemned? In ſaying ſo you condemne the holy Councell at *Sardica*, of *Conſtantinople*, of *Epheſus*, of *Chalcedon*, for they all did *noviter* condemne ſuch perſons being dead, as in their lives time had not beene condemned. Now the holy Fathers of thoſe Councels, having thus condemned the dead, dyed themſelves in the Lord, and were in peace gathered to the Lord. If you ſay, they ſhould not have condemned the dead, even in ſaying ſo you doe *noviter* condemne all thoſe Fathers being now dead; and ſo you doe that ſame thing, which you ſay muſt not bee done; and even by defending your poſition, you overthrow your owne poſition; for you doe *noviter* condemne all thoſe holy Fathers being dead; and yet you ſay, that no man may *noviter* condemne the dead: Nay, you condemne not them only, but even your own ſelfe alſo herein, for you condemne thoſe, who condemne the dead, and yet your ſelfe condemnes all thoſe holy Fathers, being now dead; and you condemne them for doing that, which your ſelfe now doe; even for condemning the dead. Such a ſtrange diſcord there is in this hereticall poſition of *Vigilius*, that it not only fights againſt the truth, and the oppoſites unto it; but viper-like, even againſt it ſelfe, and againſt the favourers, and defenders of it.

Cap. VII.

That the ſecond reaſon of Vigilius *touching the* firſt Chapter, *why* Theodorus *of Mopſveſtia ought not to be condemned, becauſe he dyed in the peace, and communion of the Church, is erronious and untrue.*

1. THE ſecond reaſon of *Vigilius*, why *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia* ſhould not bee condemned, is, for that (as he ſuppoſeth) *Theodorus* dyed in the peace and communion of the Church: to this purpoſe he ſaith, *that* [a] *the rules of his predeceſſors (which he applyeth to* Theodorus*) did keepe inviolate the perſons of Biſhops, in pace Eccleſiaſtica defunctorũ, who dyed in the peace of the Church.* And again, *We* [b] *doe eſpecially provide by this our preſent Conſtitution, leſt by occaſion of perverſe doctrine, any thing be derogated from the perſons of them, who, as wee have ſaid, in pace & communione univerſalis Eccleſiæ quieverunt; have dyed in the peace and communion of the Catholike Church;* and that no contumelie be done to thoſe Biſhops, *qui in pace Catholicæ Eccleſiæ*

a *Vigil. Conſt. apud Bar. an. 553. nu. 179.*

b *Ibid. nu. 184.*

ſiæ ſunt defuncti; who have dyed in the peace of the Catholike Church. Now that *Theodorus* ſo dyed *Vigilius* proveth not, but takes as conſequent upon the former point, which, as we have [c] ſhewed, was knowne and confeſſed, becauſe [d] he was not in his life time condemned by the Church. Nor was *Vigilius* the firſt founder of this reaſon, he borrowed it of other Neſtorians, with whom in this cauſe he was joyned both in hand and heart. They (to wit, the followers of *Theodorus* and *Neſtorius*) flee unto another vaine excuſe, ſaith [e] *Iuſtinian*, affirming that *Theodorus* ought not to be condemned, *eò quod in communione Eccleſiarum mortuus eſt; becauſe he dyed in the communion of the Churches.*

c *Sup. ca. 6.*

d *Perſpeximus ſi quid de his qui defuncti ſunt, & minime reperiuntur in vita damnati. Vig. loc. cit. nu. 176. Quos vocat, In pace Eccleſiæ defunctos. Ibid. nu. 179. & 184.*

e *Iuſt. Edict. § Quod autem.*

2. I ſhall not need to ſtay long in refuting this reaſon of *Vigilius*: The Emperour hath done it moſt ſoundly, and that before ever *Vigilius* writ his *Conſtitution. Oportebat* [f] *eas ſcire, thoſe men who plead thus* for *Theodorus, ſhould know that they dye in the communion of the Church, who unto their very death doe hold that common doctrine of piety which is received in the whole Church. Iſte autem uſque ad mortem in ſua permanens impietate, ab omni Eccleſia ejectus eſt; but this* Theodorus *continuing in his impiety to his death, was rejected by the whole Church.* Thus *Iuſtinian.* To whoſe true teſtimonie *Binius* aſcribeth ſo much as well hee might, that whereas ſome reported of *Theodorus* that he recalled his hereſie, this, ſaith he, *might* [g] *be beleeved, niſi Iuſtinianus,* unleſſe the Emperor had teſtified that he dyed in his hereſie.

f *Iuſt. ibid.*

g *Bin. Notis in Conc. 5. verbo Theodorus.*

3. The ſame is clearly witneſſed alſo in the fift [h] Councell, where, as it were of purpoſe, this reaſon of *Vigilius* is refuted in this manner; *Whereas it is ſaid of ſome* (and *one of thoſe is* Vigilius) that *Theodorus* died in the peace and communion of the Church, *mendacium eſt & calumnia, magis adverſus Eccleſiam; this is a lie and ſlander, and that eſpecially to the Church.* For he is ſaid to die in the communion and peace of the Church, *qui uſque ad mortem rectæ Eccleſiæ dogmata ſervavit; who hath kept and held the true doctrines of faith, even till his death:* But that *Theodorus* did not keepe thoſe doctrines, *certum eſt, it is certaine* by his blaſphemies: and *Gregory Niſſen* witneſſeth the ſame. And after the words of *Gregory* recited, they adde this, *quomodo conantur dicere, how doe any ſay,* that ſuch an impious and blaſphemous perſon as *Theodorus* was, dyed in the communion of the Church? Thus teſtifieth the Councell.

h *Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 552. a..*

4. Can ought be wiſhed more pregnant to manifeſt the foule errours of *Vigilius* in this part of his decree? *Vigilius* affirmeth that *Theodorus* dyed in the peace and communion of the Catholike Church: The Emperour and Councell not onely teſtifie the contrary, but for this very cauſe the Councell (impatient at ſuch indignitie offered to Gods Church,) cals him in plaine termes a lyar, and a ſlanderer; yea, a ſlanderer of the whole Catholike Church in ſo ſaying. *Vigilius* from the not condemning of *Theodorus* in his life time, collecteth, that hee dyed in the peace and communion

communion of the Church: both the Emperour and Councell witneſſe his doctrinall errour herein: truly teaching, that though an heretike live all his life time, not onely uncondemned by the Church, but in all outward pompe, honour, and applauſe of the Church; either himſelfe cunningly cloaking, or the Church not curiouſly, and warily obſerving his hereſie while hee liveth; yet ſuch a man neither lives, nor dyes in the intire peace and communion of the Church. The Church hath ſuch peace with none, who have not peace with God; nor communion with any, who have not union with Chriſt. It condemned him not, becauſe, as it teacheth others, ſo it ſelfe judgeth moſt charitably of all: It judged him to be ſuch, as hee ſeemed, and profeſſed himſelfe to bee. It was not his perſon, but his profeſſion, with which the Church in his life time had communion and peace; As ſoone as ever it ſeeth him not to bee indeed ſuch as hee ſeemed to bee, it renounceth all peace and communion with him, whether dead, or alive: nay, rather it forſaketh not her communion with him, but declareth unto all, that ſhee never had communion or peace with this man, ſuch as hee was indeed before, though ſhe had peace with ſuch as he ſeemed to bee. Shee now denounceth a double anathema againſt him, condemning him firſt for beleeving or teaching hereſie, and then for covering his hereſie under the viſor of a Catholike, and of the Catholike faith. So juſtly and fully doth the Emperour, and Councell refute, both the perſonall errour of *Vigilius* in that hee affirmeth *Theodorus* to have dyed in the peace of the Church; and the doctrinall alſo, in that he affirmeth it upon this ground, that in his life time hee was not condemned by the Church.

i *Acceſſerunt dignæ cauſæ ac rationes. Bar. an. 553. nu. 233.*

5. Now whereas i *Baronius* ſaith, that *Vigilius* had juſt, and worthy reaſons to defend this *firſt Chapter*: one of which is this, becauſe, if this were once admitted that one dying in the communion of the Church, might after his death be condemned for an heretike; *pateret oſtium*, there would a gap be opened, that every eccleſiaſticall writer, *licet in communione Catholica defunctus eſſet*; *although hee dyed in the communion of the Catholike Church*, might after death be out of his writings condemned, for an heretike; truly hee feareth where no feare is at all. This gap, nay, this gate and broad ſtreet of condemning the dead hath laine wide open this ſixteen hundred years. Can the Cardinall, or any of his friends in all theſe ſucceſſiõs of ages, wherin have dyed many thouſand millions of Catholikes; can he name or finde but ſo much as *one* who hath truly dyed in the peace and communion of the Church, and yet hath beene after his death condemned by the Catholike Church for an heretike? He cannot. The Church ſhould condemnẽ her owne ſelfe, if ſhee condemned any with whom ſhe had peace, and whom ſhe embraceth in her holy communion, which is no other but the ſociety with God. Such indeed may dye in ſome errour, yea, in an errour of faith, as *Papias*, *Irinee*,

Irenee, Iuſtine, in that of the millenaries: as *Cyprian*, (as is likely) and other Africane Biſhops in that of *Rebaptization*; but either dye heretikes, or be after their death condemned by the Catholike Church, for heretikes, they cannot.

6. But there is moſt juſt cauſe why the Cardinall, and all his fellowes, ſhould feare another matter, which more neerely concernes themſelves; and feare it, even upon that Catholike poſition, that the dead out of their writings may juſtly bee condemned. They ſhould feare to have ſuch an itching humour to write in the Popes Cauſe; for his ſupremacy of authority, or *infallibility* of his *Cathedrall* judgement: feare to ſtuffe their Volumes (as the Cardinall hath done his *Annals*) with hereſies, and oppoſitions againſt the faith; feare to continue and perſiſt in their hereticall doctrine: feare to die before they have attained to that which is *ſecunda poſt naufragium tabula*; *the ſecond and onely boord to ſave them after their ſhipwracke*; to dye I ſay, before they revoked, diſclamed, condemned, or beene the firſt men to ſet fire to their hereticall doctrines and writings; and at leaſt, in words, if not, as the [k] cuſtome was, *by oath, and handwriting, to teſtifie to the Church, their deſire to returne unto her boſome.* Theſe are the things indeed they ought to feare, knowing that howſoever they flatter themſelves with the vaine name of the Church; yet in very truth, ſo long as their writings remaine; teſtifying that they defended the Popes *infallibility* in defyning *cauſes of faith*, or any other doctrine relying on that ground, whereof in their life time they have not made [l] a certaine, and knowne recantation, they neither lived nor dyed in the peace and communion of the Catholike Church, but may at any time after their death, and ought whēſoever occaſiō is offered, be declared by the Church to have dyed in their hereſies, and therefore dyed both out of the peace of God, and of the holy Church of God. This, unleſſe they ſeriouſly and ſincerely performe, it is not I, nor any of our writers, (whom they imagine, but moſt unjuſtly, out of ſpleene and contention to ſpeake theſe things) who condemne them, but it is the whole Catholike Church; Shee, by approving this fift Councell and the true decree therof, condemns this *Apoſtolicall* & *Cathedral* definition of *Vigilius*, and all that defend it; that is, all the *members* of the preſent Romane Church, to be hereticall; and as convicted heretikes, ſhe declares them to die anathematized; that is, utterly ſeparated from God, and from the peace, and moſt bleſſed communion with the Church of God; howſoever they boaſt themſelves to be the onely children of the Church of God.

7. If any ſhall here reply, or thinke, that by the former examples of *Papias, Irenee, Iuſtine, Cyprian*, and the reſt, *Baronius*, and other mēbers of the preſent Romane church may be excuſed; that theſe alſo, as the former, though dying in their error, may dye in the peace & cōmunion of the Church; this I confeſſe is a friendly, but no firme excuſe; for although they are both alike in this,

k *In fine vitæ reconciliatio petentibus et pœnitentibus non eſt neganda, dum tamen, ſi hæretici ſint, recipiantur cum ſcriptura & juramento. Gloſſ in diſt. 1. de pœnit. ca. Multiplex.*

l *Satis eſt ut Eccleſiæ judicio conſtet aliquem deceſſiſſe impœnitentem, ſi non conſtet de illius pœnitentiâ, qui hæreticus poſt mortem cōvictus eſt. Fran. Torrenſ. lib. de 6, 7, & 8. Synod. pa. 13. & ejuſdem ſententiæ ait Pigh. fuiſſe.*

that the former as well as the latter, dye in an errour of faith; yet is there extreme odds, and many cleare dissimilitudes, betwixt the state or condition of the one, and the other.

8. The first ariseth from the *matter it selfe wherin they erre*. The former erred in that doctrine of faith, wherein the truth was not *eliquata, declarata, & solidata per plenarium Concilium*, as S. *Austen* [m] speaketh, not *fully scanned, declared, & confirmed by a plenary Councell:* Had it bin, we may well think the very same of all those holy men, which *Austen* [n] most charitably saith of S. *Cyprian, Sine dubio, universi orbis authoritate patefacta veritate cessissent; without doubt they would have yeelded to the truth, being manifested unto them, by the authority of the whole Church.* The latter erre in that, which, to use same Fathers [o] words, *per universæ Ecclesiæ statuta firmatum est; which hath beene strengthened by the decree of the whole Church.* This fift Councell, consonant to all precedent, and confirmed by all subsequent generall Councels, unto *Leo* the tenth, decreeing this cathedrall sentence of Pope *Vigilius*, to bee hereticall: whence it doth clearly ensue, that as the former, who were ready to embrace the truth, had it beene manifested unto them, erred not of pertinacy, but, as *Austen* saith, of humane infirmitie; so the latter, who reject the truth being manifested unto them, and withstand the knowne judgement of the whole catholike Church, even that judgement which is testified by all those witnesses, to be consonant to the Scriptures, and *Apostolicall* doctrine, can no way be excused from most wilfull and pertinacious obstinacy, seeing they adhere to that opinion, which themselves, or their particular church hath chosen, though they see, and know the same to be repugnant to Scripture, & the consenting judgement of all generall and holy Councels, that is, of the whole catholike Church. So the errour of the former, though it was in a point of faith, yet was but materially to be called heresie, as being a doctrine repugnant to faith; yet being not joyned in them with pertinacie, which is essentially, as *Canus* [p] sheweth, required in an heretike, could neither make, nor denominate them to be heretikes: The errour of the latter, is not onely an errour in a point of faith, but is formally to bee called heresie, such as being both a doctrine repugnant to faith, and being in them joyned with pertinacy, doth both make, and truly denominate them, who so erre, to be heretikes; and shew them to hold it heretically, not onely as an errour, but as a most proper heresie.

9. The second difference is in the *manner of their errour*. The former held their opinions as probable collections, not as undoubted doctrines of faith; and so long as those errours were so held, the Church suspended [q] her judgement, both concerning the doctrines, and the persons. And this was at least untill the time of *Ierome*, touching the millenary opinion; for he mentioning the same, saith [r] thus; *Hæc licet non sequamur, tamen damnare non possumus, quia multi Ecclesiasticorum virorum & martyrum ista dixerunt;*

m *Aug. lib. 2. de bapt. ca. 4.*

n *Ibid.*

o *Aug. lib. eod. c. 1.*

p *Quod hæresis esse sine pertinacia nequeat, non est difficile ostendere cõmunẽ omnium Theologorum sententia, &c. Canus lib. 12. Loc. Theol. ca. 9. § Quod.*

q *Sancta Ecclesia aliquandiu de ea re supersedit, judicium q; suspendit. Bar. notis in Martyr. in Febr. 22. voce Papiæ.*

r *Hier. in cap. 19. Ieremiæ.*

dixerunt : Theſe things (concerning the raigne of Chriſt for one thouſand yeares upon earth, in a terreſtriall, but yet a golden Ieruſalem) *although we doe not our ſelves follow, yet wee cannot condemne them, becauſe many of the Eccleſiaſticall writers and Martyrs have ſaid the ſame :* whereby it is evident, that in *Ieromes* [s] time nothing was defined herein by the Church; for then *Ierome* might, and would conſtantly have condemned that errour by the warrant of the Churches authoritie, which then hee held to bee a probable, and diſputable matter. In which regard alſo *Auſten calleth it a tolerable* [t] *opinion*, and ſuch as himſelfe had ſometimes held, if the delights of the Saints in that time be ſuppoſed to be ſpirituall. *Baronius* tels [u] us, (how rightly I will not now examine,) that when *Apollinarius* renewed this opinion, and urged it, *ut dogma Catholicum*, no longer as a matter of probabilitie, *but as a Catholike doctrine of faith*; It was then condemned by Pope *Damaſus* about the time of *Ierome*; and ſo being condemned by the Church, it was ever after that held for an hereſie; and the defenders of it, for heretikes.

s *Hieronimi tempore nihil adhuc ab Eccleſia ac ea re fuit definitum. Bar. notis in Martyr. loc. cit.*

t *Quæ opinio eſſet utcunq; tolerabilis, ſi, &c. Aug. lib. 20. de Civit. Dei. ca 7.*

u *Bar. an. 118. nu. 2. et an. 373. nu. 14*

10. Did *Baronius* and the reſt of the Romane Church in like ſort, as thoſe *millenary* Fathers, commend their Popes *infallibility* no otherwiſe then as a probable, a topicall, or diſputable matter, the like favourable cenſure would not be denyed unto them, but that they alſo, notwithſtanding that error in faith, might die in the communion of the Church. But when Pope *Vigilius* publiſhed his *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution*, as *a doctrine with ſuch* [x] *neceſſitie to be received of all, that none either by word or writing might contradict the ſame*; when the chiefe Pillers of their Church urge the Popes *Cathedrall* definitions in cauſes of faith, for ſuch as wherein, *nullo* [y] *caſu errare poteſt, he can by no poßibilitie bee deceived, or teach amiſſe*; when they urge this, not onely as *Apollinarius* did the other, *ut dogma Catholicum, as a doctrine of faith*; but as the *foundation* of all the doctrines of faith; It was high time for the Catholike Church, as ſoone as they eſpied this, to creepe into the hearts of men, to give ſome ſoveraigne antidote againſt ſuch poyſon, and to prevent that deluge of hereſies, which they knew, if this Cataract were ſet open, would at once ruſh in, and overwhelme the Church of God. And therefore the fift generall, and holy Councell, to preſerve for ever the faith of the Church againſt this hereſie, did not onely condemne it, decreeing the *Apoſtolicall* and cathedrall ſentence of Pope *Vigilius* to be hereticall; but decreed all the defenders of it to be accurſed, and ſeparated from God, and Gods Church; ſo that whoſoever after this ſentence and decree of the holy Synod, approved by the whole Catholike Church, ſhall defend the Popes Cathedrall judgements as *infallible*, and dye in that opinion, they are ſo farre from dying as *Papias* and *Irene* did, in the peace of the Church; that by the whole catholike Church they are declared, and decreed to dye out of the peace and communion of the whole catholike Church.

x *Statuimus, nulli licere quicquam contrarium his conſcribere, vel proferre. Vig. Conſt. in fine*

y *Bell. lib. 4. de Pōt. ca. 3. et Gretz. def. ca. 2. lib. 1. de Pont. pa. 652. et aly.*

11. A third diſſimilitude ariſeth from the *perſons who erre*. The former, for all their errour; held [z] faſt the unity with the Church, even with thoſe who contradicted and cõdemned their errours; and we doubt not but that was verified of very many of them, which *Auſten* [a] affirmeth of *Cyprian*, that they kept this unitie of the Church, *humiliter, fideliter, fortiter, ad martyrij uſque coronam; kept it with humility, with fidelitie, with conſtancy, even to the crowne of martyrdome.* By reaſon of which their charity they were not onely faſt linked, and, as I may ſay, glued to the communion of the Church, both in their life, and death, but all their other errours, as *Auſten* [b] ſaith, *became veniall unto them*: for charity covereth a multitude of ſinnes. The latter are ſo unlike to theſe, that with their errour, and even by it, they have made an eternall breach, and ſeparation of themſelves from the Catholike Church; even from all who conſent unto, or approve this fift generall Councell: for having by their *Laterane* decree erected, and ſet up in the Romane Capitol, this pontificall ſupremacy, and *infallibilitie, they now account all but Schiſmatickes* [c] *who conſent not with them; they will have no peace, no cõmunion with any, who will not adore this Romiſh Calfe of the ſupreme & infallible autheritie of their vice-god.* So the former, notwithſtãding their error, died in the peace of that Church, to which, by moſt ardent affection they were conjoyned: The latter dying in this their errour, whereby they cut off, and quite diſ-joyne themſelves from the union of all, who approve the decree of the fift Councell, (and thoſe are the whole catholike Church of all ages) though they dye in the very armes, and boſome of the Queene of *Babylon*, cannot chuſe but die out of the bleſſed peace, and holy communion of the whole catholike Church, which they have wilfully, inſolently, and moſt diſdainfully rejected.

12. The fourth and laſt difference which I now obſerve, ariſeth from the *judgement* of the Church concerning them both. The former, ſhe is ſo farre from once thinking to have dyed in hereſie, or heretikes, that ſhee moſt gladly teſtifieth her ſelfe not onely to hold them in her communion, but to eſteeme and honour them as glorious Saints of the Church. *Papias* [d] the author of that opinion, a Saint, *Irene*, [e] *Iuſtine*, and *Cyprian*, both Saints, and Martyrs. On the parties which hold the latter error, ſhe hath paſſed a contrary doome; for by decreeing the *Cathedrall* ſentence of *Vigilius* to be hereticall, and accurſing all who defend it; ſhe hath clearely judged and declared all who defend the Popes *infallibilitie* in defining cauſes of faith, to bee heretikes, & dying ſo, to die heretikes; yea, convicted heretikes, anathematized by the judgement of the catholike Church, and ſo pronounced to die out of the peace and communion of the catholike Church.

13. I have ſtayed the longer in diſſolving this doubt, partly for that it is very obvious in this cauſe; and yet (as to me it ſeemed)

z *Cyprianus ita dixit, quia ei videretur, ut in pace unitatis eſſe voluerit, etiam cum eis qui de hac re diverſa ſentirent.* Aug. lib. 2. de baptiſ. ca. 1

a Lib. 1. de baptiſ. ca. 18.

b *Charitate præſenti quædam (veritates) venialiter non habentur.* Aug. ibid.

c *Nemo poteſt ſubeſſe Chriſto, & communicare cũ Eccleſia, qui non ſubeſt Pontifici Rom.* Bell. lib. de Eccl. milit. ca. 5. *Schiſma eſt quando unum membrum nõ vult eſſe ſub illo capite, quare tollit unitatem eſſentialem atq; Eccleſia ipſam. Schiſmaticus igitur non eſt de Eccleſia.* Ibid. & ſimilia habent alij.

d *Natalis beati Papiæ. Martyr. Rom. Feb. 22.*

e *Paſſio Irenei Epiſcopi & Martyris. Mart. in martij 24 & Menol. Græc. in Aug. 23.*

med not very eaſie; but ſpecially that hereby I might open another errour in the *Conſtitution* of *Vigilius*, who from the example of thoſe *Millenarie* Fathers (one of which, to wit *Nepos*, he expreſly mentioneth)[f] would conclude, *That none at all though dying in hereſie, may after their death be condemned*, ſeeing *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, though he condemned the bookes and errour of *Nepos*, yet *Nepos* himſelfe hee did not injure, nor condemne, *propter hoc maxime, quia jam defunctus fuerat, for this reaſon eſpecially, becauſe Nepos was dead.* But by that which now at large I have declared, it appeareth, that *Vigilius* was twice miſtaken in this matter, for neither did *Nepos* die in a formall hereſie, but in an errour onely at that time, to which he did not pertinaciouſly adhere; though *Prateolus* [g], and after him, the Cardinall,[h] upon what reaſon I know not, but ſure none that is good, reckons *Nepos* with *Tertullian*, as one excluded from the ranke and order of catholikes: neither did *Dionyſius* or the Church, for that reaſon at all which *Vigilius* fancieth; much leſſe for that eſpecially, forbeare to condemne *Nepos*, becauſe he was dead: (for then they would not have condemned *Valentinus, Baſilides, Cerinthus*, who alſo were dead [i], when the Church condemned them,) but becauſe they judged *Nepos* as well as *Irene*, *Iuſtine*, and the reſt, to have dyed, though in an error, yet in the unity, peace, and communion of the Church. And this the words of *Dionyſius* [k], not rightly alleaged by *Vigilius*, and no better tranſlated by *Chriſtopherſon* doe import. For *Dionyſius* ſaid not, that hee therefore reverenced *Nepos, quia jam defunctus fuerat*, as the one [l], nor *quia ex hac vita migravit*, as the other [m] readeth them, that is, becauſe he was dead, (for upon that reaſon the holy Biſhops ſhould have reverenced alſo *Simon Magus, Cerinthus*, and other heretickes, who were then dead) but becauſe [illegible] which *Muſculus* very rightly tranſlateth thus; I much reverence him as one, *qui jam ad quietem præceſſit, who is gone before mee unto reſt*: that is, becauſe hee ſo dyed, that his death was a paſſage to reſt; even to that reſt of which the ſcripture [n] ſaith, uſing the ſame words, *they reſt from their labour*: to that reſt unto which himſelfe hoped to follow *Nepos*: for that *Nepos* is gone before to this reſt; therefore did *Dionyſius* reverence him. So both the aſſertion of *Vigilius* which from *Dionyſius* he would prove, is untrue, that none who are dead may bee condemned, and yet the ſaying of *Dionyſius* is true, that ſuch as goe to reſt, or dye in the peace of the Church, ought not to bee condemned.

14. After this which the Cardinall hath ſaid in generall concerning ſuch as dye in the peace of the Church, hee addeth one thing in particular concerning *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia*, by way of application of that generall poſition unto him, ſaying [o] that *Vigilius* was therefore very ſlacke to condemne him, becauſe hee would not condemne thoſe, *quos ſciſſet in catholica communione defunctos*,

f *Vig. conſt. loc. cit. nu.* 178.

g *Prateolum Nepotem recenſet inter hæreticos, tum in Indice, tum in libro ipſo, in ſuo Elench. verbo Nepos. Et ait eum fuiſſe authore Epicuræ illius opinionis, in verbo Chiliaſtæ.*

h *Mittimus Tertullianum & Nepotem extra claſſem hereticorum vagantes. Bar. Not. in Martyr. Feb. 22.*

i *Iuſtin. in Edicto § Quod autem.*

k *Apud Euſeb. lib. 7. Eccl. hiſt. ca. 19.*

l *Vigilius.*

m *Chriſtopher. in ſua tranſlatione.*

n *Apoc. 14. 13.*

o *Bar. an. 553. nu. 491.*

functes, whom he knew to have died in the catholike communion of the Church. So the cardinall tells us that *Vigilius* knew, and therefore that it is not onely true, but certaine, that *Theodorus* dyed in the catholike communion.

15. What thinke you doth the cardinall gaine by pleading thus for *Theodorus* a condemned heretike? Truly for his paines herein the holy Councell payes him foundly: for first in plaine termes it calls him a lyar, and a ſlanderer, yea a ſlanderer of the whole Church, and if this be not enough, it denounceth an *Anathema* unto him for ſo ſaying: Curſed bee hee that curſeth not *Theodorus*; how much more curſed then is he, who acquits *Theodorus* from that curſe, who makes *Theodorus* bleſſed? for bleſſed are all they that dye in the peace and holy communion of the Church, and that *Theodorus* ſo dyed the Cardinall for a certainty doth aſſure us; for *Vigilius* knew that he ſo dyed.

16. But what Church I pray you is that in the communion whereof the Cardinall aſſures us *Theodorus* to have dyed? you may bee ſure it is their Romane: for in the Cardinalls idiome thats not onely κατ' ἐξοχὴν the Church, but its the *one and onely Church.* In the communion then of their Romane church, even in the communion with the Cardinall himſelfe dyed *Theodorus.* Now its certaine, he died not in the communion of the Church, which was in the fift generall Councell, for they utterly diſclaim him, accurſe him, and call them lyars, and ſlanderers, that ſay hee dyed in their communion. Againe, its certaine that the Church of that fift Councell, was of the ſame communion with the whole Catholike and Apoſtolike Church; themſelves profeſſing to hold the ſame faith, and communion with all former holy generall Councells, and Catholikes, and all ſucceeding catholikes by approving it, profeſſing the ſame faith and communion with it. Seeing then *Theodorus* dyed not in the communion of this Church, which is the true and truly catholike Church, and yet dyed as the Cardinall aſſures you in the communion of their Romane church, it doth clearly and certainly hence enſue, that their Romane church is neither the true catholike, neither hath full communion with the true catholike Church.

17. Laſtly, ſeeing *Theodorus* as the Cardinall tells us, died in the peace, and communion of their Church, and *Theodorus* was moſt certainly an heretike, condemned by the catholike Church; declared by the ſame Church to bee accurſed, that is, ſeparated from God; nay to be a very Devill, as the holy Councell [p] proclaimed him; Their Romane church muſt needes bee at peace, and of the ſame communion with condemned heretikes, with *Anius, Neſtorius, Eutiches, Eunomius,* (none of them all can bee worſe then as *Theodorus* was, condemned heretikes, by the judgement of the whole Church:) of the ſame communion with thoſe who are ſeparated from God; yea it muſt needs be at peace, and league with the Devills communicants. Since this is the peace, this

[p] *Hoc ſymbolum Satanas compoſuit, Conc. 5. ita ait de ſymbolo Theodori, Collat. 4. pa. 537. a.*

this the communion of their church (if *Theodorus* dyed, as the Cardinall affureth us he did, in the peace and communion of it) let them for ever keep to themſelves, let them alone enjoy, both alive and dead, this peace, this communion, of their Church. But let diſ-union, and immortall warres, be for ever betwixt us, and it; betwixt the ſociety with God, and all communion with it.

——— Nullus amor populis, nec fœdera ſunto;
Littora littoribus contraria, fluctibus undas,
Imprecor; arma armis, pugnent cinereſque, nepoteſque,
Et nati natorum, & qui naſcentur ab ipſis.

And let this ſuffice, to be oppoſed againſt the ſecond reaſon of *Vigilius*, who therefore decreed that *Theodorus* ought not to be condemned, becauſe, as he thought, nay knew, as *Baronius* ſaith, that *Theodorus* dyed in the peace & communion of the Church.

CHAP. VIII.

That the third and laſt reaſon of Vigilius *touching the* firſt chapter *why* Theodorus *of* Mopſveſtia *ought not to bee condemned,* becauſe he was not condemned by former Fathers, and Councells, *is erroneous and untrue.*

1. 

THe third and laſt reaſon of Pope *Vigilius* in defence of the *firſt Chapter*, is drawne from the authority of the ancient *Fathers* and *Councells*; by none of which, as he pretendeth, *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia* was condemned, and therefore ought not now by himſelfe, or any other to be condemned. And *Vigilius* was ſo exceeding carefull to enforme both himſelfe, and all others of the certainty, and truth herein, that hee ſaith, wee [a] added, *ſolicitudinis noſtræ animum, the carefull ſolicitude of our thoughts*, and *diligentiſſima inveſtigatione quærere curamus : Wee have taken moſt diligent care to finde out*, whether any thing was decreed, ordered, or diſpoſed by the Fathers, *de perſona, vel nomine, either concerning the perſon, or the name of Theodorus :* and againe, *Omnibus diligenter inſpectis; We have diligently viewed all things belonging to this matter*. Now after all this carefull, ſolicitous, diligent, yea moſt diligent inſpection, *Vigilius* ſaith, that, *neither in the Councell of Epheſus* [c], *nor of Chalcedon* [d], *nor in Cyril* [e], *nor in Proclus* [f], *nor in other Fathers, could hee finde that Theodorus was ever condemned.*

2. Truly *Vigilius* had exceeding dimme eyes in this cauſe: or to ſpeake more truly, *Neſtorianiſme* had ſo blinded, and put out his eye-ſight, that he could diſcerne almoſt nothing; though it were never ſo cleare, and obvious, unleſſe it favoured the condemned hereſie of *Neſtorius*. Can you ſee neither the perſon, nor

a *Vig. Conſt. nu.* 173.
b *ibid. nu.* 179.
c *Ipſam Synodum Epheſinam ſolicite recenſentes, nihil de Theodori perſona, referre cõperimus. ibid. nu.* 173.
d *Sed neq; in ſancto Chalcedonenſi concilio aliquid de Theodori nomine invenimus ſtatutũ. ibid. nu.* 175.
e *Ex quo claret beatum Cyrillum nec luiſſe nomen ejus (Theodori) monumentis Synodalibus propter regulam quæ de mortuis ſervanda eſt, contineri. ibid. nu.* 173.
f *Quando ſcripſi oportere aut Theodorum aut alios qui prioris defuncti ſunt anathemati ſubdi oportere. ibid. ex Proclo. nu.* 174.

nor the name of *Theodorus* condemned by the Fathers? not by *Cyrill?* not by *Proclus?* not by the Councells of *Epheſus*, and *Chalcedon?* not by others? Suffer me I pray you, to helpe the Popes ſight with ſome better ſpectacles. Of *Cyrill* and *Proclus*, the fift Councell, after a farre better view, and inſpection, even in the Synodall decree, doe thus witneſſe. They [g] ſhew their meaning concerniug *Theodorus, quod oportet eum anathematizari, that he ought to be accurſed*, as we have demonſtrated before, out of thoſe things, which *Cyrill*, and *Proclus* have written, *ad condemnationem Theodori, for the condemning of Theodorus, and his impiety.* In another place, [h] of them both they write againe in this manner, *Let them who pretend the names of Cyrill, and Proclus, ſay if Theodorus be not by them numbred with the Iewes, Pagans, Sodomites and heretikes*; particularly of *Cyrill*, they ſay [i], *Cyrill ſeeing that divers continued to defend the blaſphemies of Theodorus, was forced to write bookes againſt him and his impieties, & poſt mortem ejuſdem Theodori, oſtendere eum & hæreticum, & impium, & ſuper Paganos, & ſuper Iudæos blaſphemium. And after the death of the ſame Theodorus, to ſhew him to have beene an heretike, and more blaſphemous then either the Iewes or Pagans.* This the Councell ſaw in the writings of *Cyrill*, and *Proclus*, and upon their ſight and knowledge teſtified the ſame.

g *Conc. 5. coll. 8. pa. 585. b.*

h *Coll. 5. pa. 551. b.*

i *Ibid. pa. 551. a.*

3. The words of *Cyrill*, and *Proclus* doe clearly witneſſe the ſame. *Cyrill* ſpeaking [k] of *Theodorus, calls him one, whoſe tongue ſpeakes iniquity againſt God; one whoſe horne is exalted againſt God: one who inſulteth* [l] *over Chriſt, who leſſeneth the crimes of the Iewes, who pulleth him downe, ad infamiam, to infamie and diſgrace. Proclus* alſo ſpeaking [m] not only of the doctrine, but of the perſon of *Theodorus*, whom he ſetteth in the ſame ranke with *Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius*, and other heretikes, he calleth him as hee doth the reſt, *turbulentos, & cænoſos fallaciæ rivos, filthy and mirie rivers of deceit*; adding, *that the new blaſphemie (which was taught by Theodorus and Neſtorius) doth farre exceed, the blaſphemie of the Iewes.* Thus *Proclus*. Where thinke you was the Popes eyes, when hee could not, or would not ſee any of all this? Or if yet wee doubt of *Cyrills* minde herein, *Baronius* [n] himſelfe could not chuſe, but obſerve this out of him, you ſee that *Cyrill* doth *una, eademque lance, Theodorum expendere cum Neſtorio, put him in the ſame ſcale, and weigh him altogether alike, as he doth Neſtorius.* So the Cardinall checking the Popes ſight, that would not ſee him to be condemned by *Cyrill*, whom *Cyrill* eſteemed every whit as wicked an heretike as *Neſtorius*.

k *Cyrilli verba citantur in Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 551. a.*

l *Quouſq; inſultas patienti Chriſto. ibid.*

m *Epiſt. Proeli ad Armenios, de fide, extat to. 3. Bib. 5. & citantur verba ejus in Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 551. & 542. b. Proclus de Theodoro & ejus impietate ita dicit, &c.*

n *Bar. an. 435. nu. 11.*

4. But this whole matter, and the unexcuſable error of *Vigilius*, will be moſt evident, by conſidering the judgment of the *Epheſine* Councell touching *Theodorus*, and what enſued upon, or after it. That *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia*, who dyed about ſome foure [o] yeares before, was condemned in the holy Councell at *Epheſus*, *Cyrill* who was Preſident in that Councell doth declare,

o *Theodorus obijt nu. 427. Bar. nu. 27. Conc. Epheſ. habitum nu. 431. Bar. & Bin.*

as the fift Councell witneſſeth. *Cyrill* (ſay [p] they in the Synodall decree) writ unto *Iohn*, touching *Theodorus*, *utpote una cum Neſtorio anathematizato*; *as being anathematized together with Neſtorius, in the Epheſine Synod:* and this they ſhew out of the words of *Cyrill*, which are [q] worthy of moſt diligent conſideration. *Peltanus*, and after him [r] *Binius*, have very unfitly tranſlated *Cyrils* words, but in the Greeke; as alſo conſonantly thereunto they are ſet downe in the fift [s] Councell, thus; *Proceſſit adverſus omnes, qui eadem ſapiunt, vel ſapuerunt aliquando*; τὸ ἀπολύτως ὑμᾶς ἁγίας ὁσιότητα ὑμῶν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ἀναθεματίζομεν: *id quod abſolute, nos & veſtra ſanctitas dixit, Athematizamus illos, qui dicunt duos filios: That ſentence of Anathema, which we* (to wit, the holy *Epheſine* Councell) *and your Holineſſe pronounced abſolutely*, (without naming any perſon) ſaying, *we accuſe thoſe who ſay there are two Sonnes, or two Chriſts:* that ſentence proceeded againſt all who doe thinke ſo, or who have thought ſo. Thus *Cyrill*, and that alſo in one of thoſe his Synodall Epiſtles, which the holy Councell of [u] *Chalcedon*, in their very definition of faith, hath approved: ſo that this is now not onely the judgement of *Cyrill*, but of the whole Councell at *Chalcedon*. The ſame is repeated againe by *Cyrill*, and more conſpicuouſly in his Epiſtle [x] to *Anaſtaſius*, *Alexander*, and the reſt; which alſo hath equall authoritie by the Councell of *Chalcedon*. *Sancta Synodus Epheſi*, ſaith *Cyrill*, *The holy Epheſine Synod*, having pronounced a juſt ſentence of condemnation againſt *Neſtorius*, hath by the like ſentence condemned the impiety of others, *qui vel poſtea futuri ſunt, vel jam fuerunt eadem illi ſapientes*; *who either ſhall hereafter, or heretofore have thought the ſame*; *æqualem condemnationem eis imponens*; *impoſing the ſame condemnation upon them alſo:* for it is fit, that when one is condemned for ſuch vaine ſpeeches, *non contra unum tantum venire, that the ſentence ſhould not come againſt him alone*, but againſt the whole hereſie, and ſect. Thus S. *Cyrill* ſetting this downe for a golden rule to be obſerved, in all Synodall ſentences, and judgements of faith; and being ſo uſefull, the fift Synod doth often [y] inſiſt upon it.

5. Seeing then *Theodorus* did not onely teach, write, and ſpeake the ſame with *Neſtorius*, but was indeed the Archheretike, and author of this hereſie, *Neſtorius* being but his [a] diſciple, or the trunke to ſound out or blaze abroad that hereticall doctrine, which *Theodorus* had breathed into him; it is evident by this golden rule of *Cyrill*, that though *Theodorus* was dead before the Synod at *Epheſus*, yet the *anathema* and condemnation denounced by the Synod, no leſſe pertaineth to him, than to *Neſtorius*, though the one was named, and not the other. And this the fift Councell out of thoſe very words of *Cyrill*, doth collect, and warrant others to collect the ſame. The writings, ſay they, of [b] *Theodorus being in all things conſonant to the vaniloquie of Neſtorius, are together with his, deſervedly rejected by the Councell of Epheſus, utpote anathemate quod adverſus Neſtorium factum eſt*

p *Conc.5.Coll.8.pa. 585.a.*

q *In Epiſt.ad Ioh. Antioch.& Synod. cum eo.*

r *In Actis Conc. Epheſ.tom.5.ca.9.*

s *Conc.5. Coll.8 pa. 585.a.*

t *Pelt & Bin.ita vertunt, Ita & nobis & veſtræ ſanctitati abſolute dicere liceat, Anathematizamus,&c.*

u *Epiſtolas Cyrilli Synodicas ad Neſtorium et alios per Orientem, acceptiſſimas habet. Sic de ſe ait Conc.Chal.Act.5 pa.96.*

x *Quæ extat in Act.Conc.Epheſ. tom.2.Appind.1. ca.6.et citantur etiam hæc Cyrilli verba in Conc.5.Coll.8. pa.585.a.*

y *Coll.5.pa.543.b. et pa. 548.a.et in ſententia Synodali Coll.8.pa.585.a.*

a *Theodorus doctor Neſtory. Iuſtin.in Epiſt.ad Conc.5. Coll. 1.pa.519.b.et idem ait Conc.5.in ſententia Synodali Coll. 8.pa.585.b.et Neſtorius Theodori verba loquutus eſt. Coll.5.pa.550.a.et, Nec enim Theodorus Neſtorij fuit diſcipulus, ſed iſte illius Ibid.*

b *Coll. 5.pa.549.b.*

eſt procedente etiam adverſus eos, qui ante illum ſimilia illi ſapuerunt: the Anathema which was pronounced againſt Neſtorius, proceeding alſo againſt thoſe, who before Neſtorius thought the ſame which he did.

6. This ſame judgement of the *Epheſine* Councell, in condemning *Theodorus*, is yet another way declared, and teſtified expreſly by Pope *Pelagius*, *Theodorum* [c] *mortuum ſancta Synodus Epheſina damnavit; the holy Epheſine Councell condemned Theodorus being dead:* which ſo cleare a teſtimony, though alone, were enough to manifeſt the foule errour of *Vigilius* in this point. But *Pelagius* ſets downe a proofe alſo therof, which openeth another errour of *Vigilius*. He to excuſe *Theodorus*, would perſwade that [d] *Theodorus* was not the compoſer of that impious, and diabolicall creed, before mentioned. Heare now the words, and and proofe of *Pelagius*, taken from that creed: The *Epheſine* Synod, ſaith [e] he, condemned *Theodorus*, *nam cum ab ejus diſcipulis dictatum ab eo Symbolum; for when that creed, dictated and compoſed by Theodorus*, was brought forth before the *Epheſine* Synod, *cum authore damnatum eſt; both it, and the author of it was condemned preſently by the ſame holy Fathers.* So *Pelagius*: teſtifying againſt *Vigilius*, both *Theodorus* to bee the author of that creed; and both him, and it, to have beene condemned by the *Epheſine* Councell.

c Pel. 2. epiſt. 7. § *In his.*

d *Symbolum quod Chariſius Presbyter illic prodidit, &c. Vig. Conſt. loc. cit. nu.* 173.

e *Pelag. loc. cit.*

7. What *Pelagius* ſaith was formerly delivered by the whole fift Councell, who thus ſay, [f] *Theodorus*, beſides other innumerable blaſphemies, *auſus eſt & impium exponere ſymbolum, was ſo audacious as to ſet out that impious creed:* & again, *hoc impium Theodori Symbolum; this impious creed of Theodorus* was anathematized, tother with the writer of it, in the firſt *Epheſine* Councell: and againe, when this creed was repeated, which is by them [g] called, *Impium Theodori Symbolum, the impious creed of Theodorus*; the holy Synod [h] cryed out, *anathema* to him that compoſed it; (and that was *Theodorus* as themſelves witneſſe;) the holy *Epheſine* Councell accurſed this creed, *una cum authore ejus, together with the author of it.* Thus teſtified the whole Councell. Before this fift Councell, *Iuſtinian*, in his moſt religious Edict, witneſſeth the ſame. *Theodorus* (ſaith [i] hee) *who exceeds in impiety, Pagans, Iewes, and all heretikes, did not onely contemne the Nicene Creed, ſed aliud ſymbolum expoſuit, but he hath expounded another creed,* full of all impiety: and this impious creed of *Theodorus* being produced in the firſt *Epheſine* Synod, *cum ejus expoſitore, condemnatum eſt; was condemned, together with the author or compoſer of it*, by that holy Councell. So the Emperour.

f *Conc. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 575. b.*

g *Coll. 5. pa. 575. b.*

h *Coll. 4. pa. 537. a.*

i *Iuſt. Edict. § Tuli.*

8. Before all theſe, this is teſtified, and fully explaned by S. *Cyrill*, who [k] was the chiefe Biſhop in the *Epheſine* Synod: *This creed*, ſaith he, *compoſed by Theodorus*, as they, who brought it, ſaid, or witneſſed, *was rejected by the holy Councell*; and thoſe who thought as that creed taught, being condemned (in which generall ſentence *Theodorus* himſelfe was eſpecially included) *nullam*

k *Cyrilli verba ex ep. ad Procl. citantur. Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 550, 551.*

vir

viri mentionem fecit diſpenſatione, nec ipſum nominatim anathemati ſubjecit propter diſpenſationem; the Councell by a diſpenſation, made no particular mention of Theodorus, but forbare by name to denounce an anathema againſt him, by a kinde of connivence, or indulgence; leſt ſome, who held him in great account, ſhould ſeparate themſelves from the Church. So *Cyrill.* Whence two things are evident; the one that *Theodorus*, though dead before, was condemned in generall termes by the *Epheſine* Councell: The other, that they might in particular alſo have condemned him, as they did *Neſtorius*; but they forbare that particular naming of him, onely by a diſpenſation, toleration, or connivence at his name: becauſe *Theodorus* was then held by many in great account, his impieties, and blaſphemies being not as yet ſo fully diſcovered to the world: Wherein the *Epheſine* Councell imitated the wiſedome and lenitie of the Apoſtles, *who for a time by a* [l] *diſpenſation, and connivence, permitted the uſe of the Ceremoniall Law*, that ſo by inſenſible degrees the Iewes might be weaned from that, unto which they had beene ſo long accuſtomed: which examples of the Apoſtles, the fift Councell, even in their Synodall ſentence, apply to this very cauſe of *Theodorus*: the Church and *Epheſine* Councell, for a time, ſpared by name to condemne him, even then, when by their generall ſentence hee was as truly condemned, as the *Moſaicall* ceremonies were dead, (though then not deadly) to the end that the eſtimation which ſome (but very unjuſtly) had of him, might rather *diſſui*, than *diſſecari*; rather by little and little be untwined, and worne out, than by a peremptory anathema, be at once, and as it were with one violent blow, obliterated out of the hearts of ſuch as admired him, which they ſaw could hardly be effected.

l *Et talem diſpenſationem in divina ſcriptura eſt invenire. Paulus ad hoc Timotheum circumcidit, &c. Conc. 5. Coll. 8. pa. 585. b. et Coll. 5. pa. 551. b.*

9. But as the Apoſtles, when afterwards the Goſpell had been long publiſhed, and ſufficient time allowed, to forget, and bury the ceremonies, then did utterly condemne all that uſed the ſame, ſaying, *If* [m] *ye be circumciſed, Chriſt ſhall profit you nothing*: Even ſo did the Church in this cauſe of *Theodorus*. She expected that her generall ſentence ſhould have deterred all from that hereſie; ſpecially ſeeing the Emperours, *Theodoſius*, and *Valentinian*, had ſtrengthened that Synodall judgement, by a ſevere Imperiall [n] Edict, ſet forth ſome foure yeares [o] after the *Epheſine* Synod; forbidding the bookes of *Neſtorius*, either to bee read, or retained: But it fell out farre otherwiſe; for when the *Neſtorians* could no longer ſhrowd themſelves under the name, nor countenance their hereſie by the bookes and writings of *Neſtorius*, they found this new device, to [p] commend their doctrine, under the name, dignity, and authority of *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia*,, whoſe doctrine was the very ſame with that of *Neſtorius*, he having ſuckt all his hereticall poyſon from *Theodorus*, and this they thought they might ſafely doe, *Theodorus* being not by name condemned, either in the Synodall judgement, or by the Imperiall

m *Gal* 5. 2.

n *L.* 66. *de hæret. Cod. Theod.*

o *Conc. Eph. habit. an.* 431. *Baſſo et Antiocho Coſſ. ut ex Act. liquet. Tom.* 2. *ca.* 1. *Edictum vero editum Theodoſio* 15 *Coſſ. id eſt. anno* 433.

p *Confingentes enim quæ Neſtorij ſunt, odiſſe, alio iterum ca introducunt modo, quæ Theodori ſunt admirantes. Cyrill. cujus verba citantur in Conc.* 5. *Coll.* 5. *pa.* 550. *a. et idem docet Liber. ca.* 10.

Imperiall Edict. To which purpose they, and particularly [p] *Ibas*, spred abroad the bookes of *Theodorus* in every countrey, and corner, translating them, as *Liberatus* [q] sheweth, into the *Syrian*, *Armenian*, and *Persian* languages; by which meanes they deceived, and seduced many, pretending *Theodorus* [r] writings to bee consonant to the ancient fathers. The Catholikes seeing how little effect their connivence at *Theodorus* name had taken; and that the heretikes abused their lenitie in forbearing him, to strengthen their heresie; saw that now it was time, no longer to dispense or winke at *Theodorus*; and therefore the time [s] of that dispensation being expired, they began now in plaine termes, and by name, to condemne both his person, and his writings, as before they had in a generalitie performed them both in the Councell of *Ephesus*; and this was done by severall Bishops, in severall Countries, and by many severall wayes.

10. The first sentence wherein *Theodorus* was particularly, and by name condemned, was in a Councell at *Armenia*, where the credit of *Theodorus* had done most hurt. The chiefe Bishops in that Synod, were *Acatius* Bishop of *Melitiū* in *Armenia*, a very learned, & holy mā, who had bin one [t] of the chiefe also in the holy *Ephesine* Councel; and [u] *Rambulas*, or *Rabulas* Bishop of *Edessa*, (whose name it seemes the *Nestorians* for very spite against him, turned into [x] *Rabula*, that so they might with more facility revile his person) a man of such piety and high esteeme in the Church, that *Cyrill* [y] cals him *columnam, & fundamentum veritatis; the very piller and foundation of the truth*; and [z] *Benignus* testifieth, *that he was a faire and resplendent lampe in the Church.* These [a] two stirred up the Bishops of *Armenia* to reject the writings of *Theodorus*, *tanquam haretici*, as one who was an heretike; yea, the author of the *Nestorian* heresie; and themselves were present in that noble Councell of [b] *Armenia*, wherein they not onely condemned *Theodorus as an impious person, an oppugner of Christ, and the childe of the Devill*; as by the contents of the acts of that Synod [c] doth appeare; but further also, they writ their Synodal letters both to *Proclus*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, & to *Cyrill* Bishop of *Alexandria*, *quatenus fiat unitas vestra contra Theodorum, & sacrilega dogmata ejus*; *that they also would joyne with them, and their Synod, in cōdemning by name, both the person and sacrilegious writings of Theodorus*; giving this as a reason thereof, because they exhort them but to doe in plaine, and expresse manner, the same thing which was done by them before, but in a generality: We write unto you, *per vos etiam antea condemnatum sine nomine, Theodorum nominatim condemnari*; *that Theodorus may now by name bee condemned by you, who hath already, though without expressing his name, beene condemned by you.* And what they exhorted *Proclus*, and *Cyrill* to doe, that *Rambulas* performed, not onely in the *Armenian* Councell, but in his owne Church at *Edessa*; for as *Ibas* in his impious

p *Ibas quædam ex impijs Theodori Capitulis in Syrorum linguam transtulit, et ubique transmisit. Con. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 562. b.*

q *Ca. 10.*

r *Theodori scripta admirantes, et dicentes cum recta sapuisse et consonantia sanctis patribus, Athanasio, &c. Conc. 5 Coll. 5. pa. 550. a.*

s *Quoniam nec susceperunt dicta illorum, et tempus, quod dispensationis indigerent, præteriit, jam scripserunt (patres) quæ superius dicta sunt, post mortem ejus adversus eum, et ejus scripta. Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 551. b.*

t *Vt liquet ex subscriptionibus, in quibus sæpe Acatius. To. 2. Act. Conc. Ephes. ca. 3.*

u *Rambulas vocatur in Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 549. a. et apud Gratian. Caus. 24. q. 2. ca. 6. ex Emēd. Greg. 13.*

x *Sic à Liberato (Nomine Nestoriano vocatur. ca. 10. et Ibas narrat Theodorum injuste à Rabula damnatum. Bar. an. 448. nu. 72.*

y *Cyrilli Epist. ad Rabulam, in Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 543. b.*

z *Rambulas sanctæ memoriæ Episcopus, qui in Sacerdotibus exploduit. Benig. in Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 549. a.*

a *Liber. ca. 10.*

b *Fuit nobile Concilium in Armenia celebratum, cui Acatius cum Rabula interfuit, Bar. an. 435 nu. 4.*

c *Libellus transmissus ab Episcopis Armeniæ Procło, extat in Conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 542.*

Epistle

Epiſtle [d] ſaith, *Auſus eſt Theodorum clarè anathematizare, hee was bold by name, and expreſly, to anathematize Theodorus in his owne Church, and, both Benignus and Liberatus witneſſe the ſame.*

d *Quæ extat in Conc. Chal. Act. 10.*

e *Conc. 5 coll. 5. pa. 549. a.*

f *Liber. ca. 10.*

11. What *Proclus* did upon receipt of thoſe letters ſent from the *Armenian* Councell unto him, is not to be learned out of *Liberatus* report of this matter, for he in the narration of this paſſage, is not onely untrue, and partiall, but very hereticall alſo, juſtly herein taxed by *Baronius* [g], and *Binius* [h], as borrowing his narration from ſome *Neſtorians*; which the Reader will eaſily obſerve: but the truth herein muſt be taken out of *Cyrill*, and the fift Councell. *Proclus*, ſaith *Cyrill* [i], *ſent a tome or writing to them of Armenia full of ſound doctrine*, and hee adjoyned thereunto certaine chapters, *collecta è Theodori codicibus*, gathered out of the bookes of *Theodorus*, conſonant to the doctrine of *Neſtorius*, exhorting them, *etiam illa anathematizare, to accurſe even thoſe doctrines of Theodorus alſo.* The fift Councel explaines this more fully; *Proclus* ſay they [k], *writeth thus againſt Theodorus and his impious doctrine.* And then they cite, firſt thoſe words of *Proclus* before mentioned, wherein he ſets *Theodorus* in the ſame ranke with *Arius*, *Eunomius*, *Macedonius* [l], and other like heretikes, calling them all puddles of errours and deceit. And after this, thoſe other words of *Proclus*, written to *Iohn* Biſhop of *Antioch*, wherein he calleth the doctrines of *Theodorus*; or thoſe chapters which were collected out of his bookes, vaniloquie, monſtriloquie, Iudaicall impietie: *ad deſtructionem legentium evomita: doctrines vomited out by him, to the deſtruction of the readers and hearers:* exhorting others, to reject, to abhorre, to tread under foot, and to accurſe all thoſe chapters of *Theodorus: utpote diabolicæ inſaniæ conſtituta, & inventiones: as being the poſitions and inventions of deviliſh madneſſe.* From which words of *Proclus*, uttered both againſt the perſon, and doctrine of *Theodorus*: the Councell concludeth very juſtly, that *Proclus* (not onely in particular condemned *Theodorus* as the *Armenian* Councell exhorted him) but condemned him as a Iew, Pagan, and Heretike: And this was done by *Proclus* in the yeare when *Valentinian* was the 4, and *Theodoſius* the [m] 15. time Conſull, as the date of his letter or Tome to the *Armenians* doth declare; which declares alſo, that the *Armenian* Councell was held the ſame yeare [o]: for it followed the ſpreading abroad of the bookes of *Theodorus*; and that was not done till the Neſtorians were by the Imperiall Edict forbidden to reade the bookes of *Neſtorius*: Now the Imperiall Edict beares date, in the ſame conſulſhip [o], which ſhewes evidently, that as ſoone as ever the Neſtorians began to revive the honour, and name of *Theodorus* (being onely in a generality before condemned) the catholikes forthwith oppoſed themſelves, and by name condemned him. And which is ſpecially to be obſerved, *Proclus* did this againſt *Theodorus*, although the Eaſterne Biſhops intreated him [p] *plurimis deprecationibus, ut ne anathematizaretur*

g *Liberatus cautè legendus, utpote qui ab aliquo Neſtoriano eam videtur mutuatus hiſtoriam. Ba. an. 435. nu. 9.*

h *Hiſtoriam ca. 10. incautè nimis ab aliquo Neſtoriano magna ex parte mutuatus videtur. Bin. de Liberato. Notis ad Liber.*

i *Cyrilli verba citantur in Conc 5. coll. 5. pa. 543. b.*

k *Coll. 5 pa. 551. a.*

l *In Ep. ſ. Procli quæ extat in Bibl. S. pa. to. 3. corrupte legitur Manichei.*

m *Corruptè legitur in editione illa epiſt. quæ extat to. 3. B. S. pat. Theodoſio 5. pro 15. ut ex faſtis liquet*

n *Conc. Armeniæ habitum an. 435. Bar. anno illo nu. 4. is eſt Coſſ. Theodoſij 15. et Valent. 4.*

o *Coſſ. Theodoſij 15, quieſt an. 435. juxta Bar. illo an. nu. 1.*

p *Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 551. a.*

Theodorus, nec impia ejus conſcripta, did with moſt earneſt prayers ſollicite him, not to condemne the perſon, or doctrine of *Theodorus*: but, the truth of God which was oppugned by *Theodorus*, and the ſentence of the Councell which had condemned *Theodorus*, did more prevaile then all their ſupplication with that holy Biſhop.

12. Saint *Cyrill* did the like as *Proclus* herein, hee ſeeing the connivence [q], and diſpenſation of the Councell, not to take the intended effect, but that the Neſtorians proceeded rather from worſe to worſe, boaſting of *Theodorus* writings, that they were conſonant to the ancient Fathers, and ſo farre applauding him, that in ſome Churches they would cry [r] out, *Creſcat fides Theodori, ſic credimus ſicut Theodorus, let the faith of Theodorus increaſe, we beleeve as he did*: yea even ſtoning [t] ſome in the Church who ſpake againſt them, *Cyrill* ſeeing all this, could forbeare no longer, *Ego [s] iſta non ſuſtinui, ſed fiducialiter dixi*; I could not hold my ſelfe to heare thoſe things, but ſaid with great boldneſſe, and confidence, that *Theodorus was a blaſphemous ſpeaker, a blaſphemous writer, that he was an [u] heretike, mentiuntur contra ſanctos patres*; I ſaid, *that they belyed the holy Fathers*, who affirmed *Theodorus* writings, to be conſonant to theirs, *nec [x] ceſſavi increpãs ea quæ ſcripſerunt, nec ceſſabo: nor have I ceaſed, nor will I ceaſe, to reprove thoſe who write thus*: and which demonſtrates yet further the zeale of that holy Biſhop; he writ [y] the ſame things concerning *Theodorus*, to the Emperor *Theodoſius*, exhorting him [z] *to keepe his ſoule unſpoted from his impieties*. Thus *Cyrill* by name condemning both the perſon and writings of *Theodorus*.

13. The religious Emperors *Theodoſius* & *Valentinian* moved partly by the grave admonitions of *Cyrill*, and ſpecially by that diſturbance which the Neſtorians then made, by their defending and magnifying *Theodorus*; beſides the former againſt *Neſtorius*, publiſhed two other Imperiall Edicts, againſt *Theodorus*, declaring him by name, to have beene every way as blaſphemous an heretike as *Neſtorius*; and that the defenders of him, or his writings, ſhould be lyable to the ſame puniſhments, as the defenders of *Neſtorius*. Thoſe Edicts being ſo pregnant, to demonſtrate the errour of *Vigilius*, I have thought it needfull, to expreſſe ſome parts or clauſes of them.

14. We [a] againe [b] declare that the doctrine *impiorum, & peſtiferorum, of thoſe impious and peſtiferous perſons* is abominable unto us: *ſimiliter autem & omnes, and ſo are all who follow their error. It is juſt that they all have one name, and bee all clothed with confuſion, leſt while they be called Chriſtians they ſeeme to be honoured by that title*; Wherefore we by this our Law doe inact, *that whoſoever in any part of the world be found, conſenting to the moſt wicked purpoſe of Neſtorius*, and *Theodorus*, *that from hence forward they ſhall bee called Symonians, as Conſtantine decreed, that the followers of Arius ſhould be called Porphirians*. Further let none preſume either *to have*

q *Quoniam ejuſmodi diſpenſationem Cyrilli & Procli non ſuſceperunt (Neſtoriani) è contrario vero permanſerunt defendentes blaſphemias Theodori, videns Cyrillus creſcentem impietatem coactus eſt libros conſcribere adverſus Theodorum, & poſt mortem ejuſdem, tum hæreticum, & impium, et ſupra Paganos et Iudeos blaſphemum oſtendere. Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 551. a.*

r *Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 550 a.*

s *Ibid.*

t *Ibid. citantur verò verba Cyrill. ex Epiſt. ad Acac.*

u *Coactus eſt oſtendere eum eſſe hæreticum, ibid. pa. 551. a*

x *Ibid. pa. 551. a.*

y *Sed et ad Theodoſium Imper. conſonantia ſcribens. ibid*

z *Rogo ut intactas, et inviolatas animas veſtras conſervetis ab impietatibus Theodori. ibid.*

a *Extant leges illæ Theodoſij et Valent. in Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 544. 545.*

b *Iterum igitur doctrina Diodori, Theodori et Neſtorij abominanda viſa ſunt. ibid.*

have,or keepe,or write their ſacrilegious bookes, eſpecially not thoſe of Theodorus, and Neſtorius : but all their bookes ſhall bee diligently ſought, and being found,ſhall be publikely burned. Neque de cætero inveniatur prædictorum hominum memoria : neither let there be found any memorie of the foreſaid perſons : Let none receive ſuch as love that ſect,or love their teachers, either in any city,field,ſuburbs; let them not aſſemble in any place, either openly, or privily. And if any ſhall doe contrary to this our ſanction,let him be caſt into perpetuall baniſhment, and let all his goods be confiſcate. And let your excellency (they ſent this to their Lieutenant)publiſh this our Law through the whole world, in every Province, and in every city. Thus did the Emperours inact, and which is ſpecially alſo to be remembred,they inacted all this, *corroborantes* [c] *ea quæ piè decreta ſunt Epheſi, ſtrengthning thereby that which was decreed at Epheſus.*

[c] *Ibid. pa. 545. a.*

15. Whence two things may be obſerved,the one,that *Theodorus* was not onely accounted, and by name condemned for an heretike,as by other catholiks,ſo by the Emperors alſo, but that this particular condemning was conſonant to the decree of the *Epheſine* Synode, this being nothing elſe but an explanation of that,which they in generall termes had ſet down,and a corroboration of the ſame: The other,that ſeeing this Imperiall decree, hath ſtood ever ſince the inacting thereof in force and unrepealed,by vertue of it; had it beene,or were it as yet, I ſay not rigorouſly, but duly, and juſtly put in execution, not any one defender of the *three Chapters*, no not Pope *Vigilius* himſelfe, nor any who defends his *Apoſtolicall conſtitution*, (and thoſe are all the members of the preſent Romane church) not one of them, ſhold either have beene heretofore, or be now tolerated, in any city, ſuburbs, towne, village, or field; but beſides the eccleſiaſticall, cenſures and anathemaes,denounced againſt thē, by the Councell and catholike church,they ſhould endure,if no ſharper edge of the civill ſword, yet,perpetuall baniſhment out of all Chriſtian Common-wealths, with loſſe and confiſcation of all their goods.

16. After this Imperiall Law was once publiſhed, the name and credit of *Theodorus* (whoſe memory the Emperors had condemned and forbidden) grew into a generall contempt and hatred,whereof the church of *Mopſveſtia*, where hee had beene Biſhop,gave a memorable example. They for a time eſteeemed of *Theodorus*, as a catholike Biſhop, and for that cauſe kept his name in their dipticks, or Eccleſiaſticall tables; reciting him among the other Orthodox Biſhops of that city, in their Euchariſticall commemoration; But now ſeeing him detected, and condemned, both by catholike Biſhops, by Councells, and by the Imperiall Edict for an heretike, they expunged and blotted out the name of *Theodorus*, and in his roome inſerted in their dipticks, the name of *Cyrill*, who though hee was not Biſhop in

that See, yet had by his pietie and zeale manifested and maintained the faith, & brought both the hereſie & perſon of *Theodorus* into a juſt deteſtation, and all this is evident by the Acts of that Synode [d] held at *Mopſveſtia*, about this very matter, of wiping out of the name of *Theodorus*.

17. We are now come to the time of the Councell of *Chalcedon:* for, the expunging of *Theodorus* name, and inſerting of *Cyrills*, followed as it ſeemes ſhortly after the death of *Cyrill*, and he dyed about ſeven [e] yeares before the Councell of *Chalcedon*. That by it *Theodorus* was alſo condemned, their approving [f] the Councell of *Epheſius*, and the Synodall Epiſtles of *Cyrill*, (in both which, and in the later, by name [g] *Theodorus* is condemned) doth manifeſt: and beſides this the Emperour *Iuſtinian* expreſly ſaith [h] of it, that the impious Creed of *Theodorus* being recited in that Councell, both it, *cum expoſitore ejus*, *with the Author and expounder of it*, (and that was *Theodorus*) were condemned in the Councell of *Chalcedon*.

18. When many yeares after that holy Councell, ſome Neſtorians began againe, contrary to the Edict of *Theodoſius*, and *Valentinian*, to revive the dead, and condemned memory of *Theodorus*, *Sergius* Biſhop of *Cyrus* making mention [i], and commemorating him in the Collect among catholikes; the truth of this matter being examined and found, that ſame *Sergius* by the command of *Iuſtinus* the Emperour, was depoſed from his Biſhopricke, excluded out of the Church, and ſo continued even to his dying day: and this was done but ſix yeares before the Empire of *Iuſtinian*, as by the date [k] of *Iuſtinus* his letters doth appeare.

19. Now if to all theſe particular ſentences, you adde that which the fift Councell [l] witneſſeth, that *Theodorus, poſt mortem à catholica eccleſia ejectus eſt, hath beene after his death condemned, and caſt out, and that even by the whole Catholike Church*, you will eaſily confeſſe, that from the time almoſt of his death, unto the raigne of *Iuſtinian* there hath beene a continuall, and never interrupted condemnation of him in the Church. But in *Iuſtinians* time, and perhaps before, though leſſe eagerly, the Neſtorians began afreſh, to renew the memory and doctrine of *Theodorus*, ſetting now a fairer gloſſe and varniſh on their cauſe, then ever they had before: for they very gladly apprehending and applauding thoſe (to ſay the leaſt) inconſiderate ſpeeches of the Popes Legates, & *Maximus* in the Councel of *Chalcedon*, that by his dictation, or Epiſtle, *Ibas* was declared to be a catholike, hereupon they now boaſted, that the holy Councell, by approving that Epiſtle of *Ibas*, had approved, both the perſon and doctrine of *Theodorus*, ſeeing they both are highly extolled, and defended in that Epiſtle. By this meanes was this cauſe brought *ab inferis* the ſecond time, upon the ſtage, and that alſo cloaked under the name, and credit of the Councell of *Chalcedon*. And at this ſecond

d *Acta illa Synodi Mopſveſt. extant in Conc.5.Collat.5. pa. 553. & ſeq.*

e *Cyrill obijt an. 444.Conc.Chalced. habitum an. 451. Bar. et. Bin.*

f *Conc.Chalc.Act.5. in definit.Synod.*

g *Vt liquet ex Cyrilli Epiſtolis ad Iohannem Antiochē, et ad Acatium, quæ citantur in Conc.5. Coll. 5. pa. 549. et 550.*

h *Iuſtin. Edict.5. Tali.*

i *Vt teſtantur Act. Conc.5. Coll.7. pa. 578.a.et.582.a.*

k *Iuſtinus ſcripſit id edictum, Ruſtico Coſſ.Conc.5. Coll.7. pa.582. b. fuit is Coſſ.an. 520. ut teſtatur Marcell. in Chron.et agnoſcit, Bar.in illo an.nu.1 Inſtinianus vero cæpit imperare an. 527. ut Marcell.et Baron.aſſerunt.*

l *Conc.5. Coll.5.pa. 557.a.*

cond boute, all the defenders of the *Three Chapters*, and among them Pope *Vigilius*, as Generall to them all, undertooke the defence of *Theodorus*: and, as if there had never beene any sentence of condemnation, either in generall, or in particular denounced against him, even in his definitive, and *Apostolicall* constitution declareth, That *Theodorus* was not condemned, either by former Councels, or Fathers; and this he declareth after his solicitous, circumspective, and most diligent examination of their writings.

20. What thinke you was become of the Popes eyes at this time, that he could see none of all those condemnations of *Theodorus*, before mentioned? Not the general *anathema* of the Councels at *Ephesus*, and *Chalcedon*, in which *Theodorus* was involved: not the expresse, and particular *anathema* denounced against him by *Rambulas*, and *Acatius*, with the Councell of *Armenia*: not the condemnation of him, and his writings by Saint *Proclus*, by S. *Cyrill*, by the Church of *Mopsvestia*, by the Edict of the religious Emperours, by the whole Catholike Church. None of all these things were done in a corner; they were all matters of publike notice, and record; obvious to any that did not shut their eyes against the sun-shine of the truth. But, as I said before, and must often say, Nestorianisme, like *Naash* the Ammonite, had put out the Popes right eye, he could see nothing with that eye; all that he saw in this cause, was but a very oblique, and sinister aspect, as doth now, I hope, fully appeare, but will bee yet much more manifest, by that which in the *Constitution* of *Vigilius* wee are next to consider.

21. For, as if it were a small matter, not to see *Theodorus* condemned by the former Councels, and Fathers, (though in a man professing so exact and accurate inspection in any cause, such grosse oversights are not veniall) the Pope ventures one step further, for the credit of this condemned heretike. Hee could not finde that *Theodorus* was condemned by the former witnesses: Tush, that is nothing, he findes him acquitted by them all: hee findes by *Cyrill*, by *Proclus*, by the Councels of *Ephesus*, and *Chalcedon*, yea, by *Iustinians* owne law, that *Theodorus* ought not to be condemned. This was indeed a point worthy the Popes owne finding. But withall I must tell you, that you also shall finde one other thing, that Pope *Vigilius*, having once passed the bounds of truth, for defence of *Theodorus*, cares not now if he wade up to the eares, and drowne himselfe in untruths.

22. Let us then examine the allegations, which, for proofe of this, the Pope hath found; and begin we, as the Pope doth, with *Cyrill*. In his [m] Epist. to *Iohn* B. of *Antioch*, *Vigilius* found an explication, how it was said by *Cyrill*, that by a dispensation the name of *Theodorus* was not condemned; for there *Cyrill* saith, *Sed juste audient*, *they shall justly heare this*, though they will not: ye forget your selves, when you bend your bowes against ashes, that is,

m *Eam citat Vigi. in Const. nu. 173. & 174. apud Bar. an. 553.*

againſt the dead; for he who is written among them (that is, the dead) *nõ ſupereſt, is not*; and let no man blame me for theſe words, *Graveeſt enim inſultare defunctis, vel ſi Laici fuerint; for it is an hard matter, to inſult over the dead, yea, though they bee but Laikes*; how much more over thoſe, who with their Biſhopricks have left their lives. Out of which words *Vigilius* affirmeth S. *Cyrill* to teach it to be an injurious and hard matter, repugnant to the Eccleſiaſticall rule, to condemne any that is dead; and then certainly not a Biſhop, not *Theodorus*.

23. For anſwer hereunto, I doe earneſtly intreate the reader to ponder ſeriouſly the Popes good dealing herein. That Epiſtle which *Vigilius* commendeth unto us, under the name of [n] S. *Cyril*, is none of *Cyrils*, it is a baſe and counterfeit writing, forged by ſome *Neſtorians* in the name of *Cyrill*; Witneſſe hereof the whole fift generall Councell, who, of purpoſe, and at large, examined this matter, and refuted this cavill of *Vigilius*, before ever he ſet forth his *Conſtitution*; for thus they [o] ſay of it, *Some loving the perfidiouſneſſe of* Neſtorius, *which is all one as to ſay, the madneſſe of* Theodorus, doe not refuſe to faigne ſome things, and uſe certaine words, as written in an Epiſtle by S. *Cyrill*; *Nuſquam vero talis Epiſtola ſcripta eſt à ſanctæ memoriæ* Cyrillo; *but* Cyril *never writ ſuch an Epiſtle*, neither is it in his bookes. And then reciting the whole Epiſtle, and all thoſe words which *Vigilius* alleageth; they adde, *Et iſta quidem continet conficta Epiſtola; theſe are the contents of this counterfeit Epiſtle*: and a little after, That nothing of all, *quæ in conficta Epiſtola continentur, which are contained in that counterfeit Epiſtle*, was writ by *Cyrill*, it is declared by that which he writ to *Acatius*: and yet further, Theſe things are ſpoken, *ad convictionem Epiſtolæ, quæ à defenſoribus* Theodori *falſo compoſita eſt; to convince that Epiſtle to be a forgerie, which is falſely compoſed by the defenders of* Theodorus. The ſumme of this they repeate in their Synodall ſentence, ſaying, [p] *We have found, that the defenders of* Theodorus *have done the ſame which heretikes are wont to doe*; for they clip away ſome part of the Fathers words, *quædam vero falſa ex ſemetipſis componentes, & confingentes; and deviſing, or faigning other things of themſelves, they ſeeke by them, as it were, by the teſtimony of* Cyrill, *to free* Theodorus *from the Anathema*. Thus the Councell: all of them with one voyce proclaming Pope *Vigilius* for a lewd dealer, who commends, and that even in his *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution*, a falſe and forged writing, for the true Epiſtle of S. *Cyrill*.

24. It is true, *Vigilius* is not the firſt Pope, who hath blemiſhed their See, by ſuch falſe and fraudulent dealing: *Zozimus* and *Bonifacius* were long before this taxed, and that juſtly, by the Africane [q] Biſhops, *for downe-facing the Nicene Canons*. *Vigilius* was too too bold with *Cyrill*, as now you ſee. But if you deſcend to Pope *Nicholas*, or to *Gregory* the ſeventh, and their ſucceſſors, they were ſo ſhameleſſe and audacious in this kinde, that they ſcacre

n *Beatæ recordationis Cyrillum: et beatus Cyrillus. Vig. loc. cit.*

o *Conc. 5. Coll. 5. fa. 549. a.*

p *Coll. 8. fa. 585. b.*

q *Conc. Afric. Epiſt. ad Cæleſt. ca. 105. tom. 1. conc. fa. 645. et ſeq.*

ſcarce writ any decrees of importance, but they ſtuffed them with ſuch Fathers: Even the baſeſt, and moſt abject fictions, which were voyd, not onely of truth, but of braine, were fitteſt for the Popes, and their *Pontificall determinations*, and were they never ſo baſe, and baſtardly, yet the Popes, like kind *Godfathers*, could, when they liſted, chriſten them with the names of S. *Cyrill, Cyprian*, or the like, and then they muſt be called, or eſteemed for no others, than holy and reverend Fathers.

25. *Proclus* followeth: In whoſe writings *Vigilius* found three teſtimonies, to prove, that *Theodorus* being dead, was not to be condemned: The firſt is out of his Epiſtle to [r] *Iohn* Biſhop of *Antioch*; where theſe words are alleaged; When did I write to you, *oportere aut* Theodorum, *aut alios quoſdam, qui pridem defuncti ſunt, anathemate ſubdi; that either* Theodorus, *or others, being dead, ought to be anathematized?* The ſecond is out of the ſame Epiſtle; I rejected indeed thoſe Chapters, (annexed to my Tome) as being impious, *neque autem de* Theodoro, *neque de alio quoquam, qui jam defuncti ſunt*; but *I neither writ of* Theodorus, *nor of any other who is dead*, that they ſhould be anathematized, or rejected. The third is out of an Epiſtle of *Proclus* to *Maximus*; I underſtand, that the names of *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia*, and of ſome other, is prefixed to the Chapters, *ad anathematizandum, to bee anathematized*, together with the Chapters, *cum illi ad Deum jam migrarunt, whereas they are now departed to God*, and it is needleſſe to injure them, being now dead, *quos nec vivos aliquando culpavimus; whom being alive we did never reprove.* Theſe are the Popes allegations out of S. *Proclus*; in which I confeſſe it is clearely taught, that neither any after their death may bee condemned; and particularly that not *Theodorus*, ſeeing he is gone to God, and was never in his life time once reproved.

[r] *Conſt. Vig. nu. 174*

26. It is a [s] rule in law, *ſemel malus, ſemper præſumitur eſſe malus; He who is once convicted of any crime, is preſumed ſtill to be faulty in that kinde.* *Vigilius* being lately convicted to commend forgeries for the writings of Fathers, is in reaſon and equitie to bee thought to alleage ſuch a S. *Proclus*, as before hee did S. *Cyrill*: Nay, there needs no preſuming in this matter; there is evident proofe, and witneſſes, above exception, to manifeſt the ſame; even the whole fift generall Councell; who, out of the true, and undoubted writings of *Proclus*, teſtifie, that *Proclus* taught the quite contrary, both that the dead might, and particularly that *Theodorus* ought to be condemned, and that hee was by *Proclus* himſelfe condemned; for in their very Synodall decree, they thus [t] write, *Becauſe the diſciples of* Theodorus *moſt evidently oppugning the truth* (thus ſharply do they reprove *Vigilius*) *doe alleage certaine ſayings of Cyrill, and Proclus, as written for* Theodorus; It doth appeare, that thoſe Fathers doe not free him from the *Anathema*, but ſpeake thoſe things *diſpenſativè*, by way of diſpenſation, and in the very words of diſpenſation they declare of

[s] *De regulâ juris lib. 6. decret. reg. 8.*

[t] *Conc. 5. Coll. 8. pa. 585. b.*

of him, *quod oportet anathematizari* Theodorum, *that* Theodorus *ought to be anathematized*; adding, that they have demonſtrated this, even out of the words of *Cyrill*, and *Proclus*, which they writ *ad condemnationẽ ejus, for the condemning of* Theodorus. Thus writ the Councell, unto which the whole Catholike Church hath ever ſince ſubſcribed. Seeing then it is certaine that *Proclus* both taught that *Theodorus* ought to be condemned, and did himſelfe write to condemne him, there can bee no doubt, but that thoſe Epiſtles to *Iohn*, and *Maximus*, which *Vigilius* citeth; and wherein *Proclus* is made to avouch the quite contrary, that neither himſelfe did, nor that any ought to condemne *Theodorus*, are forged in the name of *Proclus*, by ſuch hands as had wrought the like feat in *Cyrill*: And if either thoſe Epiſtles were extant, (for in that of *Proclus* to *Iohn*, recorded in the fift [u] Councell, there is no ſuch thing at all) or, had this *Conſtitution* of *Vigilius* beene publiſhed, and knowne to the Councell before they had fully examined, and cleared this Chapter touching *Theodorus*; it is not to bee doubted, but the one of them, if not both would have diſcovered this forgery alſo.

[u] *Coll. 6. pa. 562.*

27. Beſides all which, there are divers evident prints of a falſe, and hereticall hand in thoſe Epiſtles. Is it injury (as that forged *Proclus* affirmeth) to condemne the dead? Nay, it is even *hereticall*, and that by the judgement of the whole Catholike Church, as before we have proved, to ſay, that the dead may not be condemned. Had *Proclus* writ, or ſaid this, he had condemned the Councels of *Sardica*, of *Conſtantinople*, of *Epheſus*, as injurious unto the dead; nor them onely, but he had condemned himſelfe, who, as we have now demonſtrated, both condemned the dead, and taught, that *Theodorus*, though dead, ought to bee condemned.

28. Did *Theodorus* at his death goe (as this forged *Proclus* affirmeth) to the Lord? a *blaſphemer*; an heretike; equall, by the judgement of *Proclus* himſelfe, to the Iewes, and Pagans, and of the ſame ranke with *Arius*, *Macedonius*, *Eunomius*, and *Neſtorius*; ſuch a blaſpheming heretike goe unto the Lord? why then did the *Epheſine* Councell, why did Saint *Cyrill*, why did *Proclus* himſelfe adjudge him to bee anathematized, that is, ſeparated from the Lord? Heretikes, and impious perſons, as living, they goe not in the wayes of the Lord, but in their owne wayes; ſo dying, they goe, like *Iudas*, to their owne place; not to the Lord, not to his habitation, and place of reſt; the Saints, and they onely goe that way. To them onely he ſaith, This day ſhalt thou be with me in Paradiſe.

29. Was *Theodorus* not ſo much as blamed; no, not ſo much as once in his life, as the forged *Proclus* ſaith? It ſeemes *Leontius* borrowed his moſt partiall ſpeech, before mentioned, out of this *Proclus*, and was too credulous unto it: But the true *Proclus* living ſo [x] neare to the time of *Theodorus*, could not bee ignorant, nor

[x] *Theodorus obyit an. 427. Proclus ſit Epiſcopus an 434. Bar. in illis annis.*

nor would ever have uttered ſo foule an untruth: for although the Church pronounced no publike cenſure by name againſt him, yet was he reproved and blamed, not onely by others complaining of his erroneous doctrine, but even by *Theophilus* B. of *Alexandria*, and *Gregory Niſſene*. This the fift Councell witneſſeth ſaying [y], Saint *Theophilus*, and Saint *Gregory Niſſene ſuſceptis querimonijs adverſus Theodorum adhuc viventem, Complaints being brought unto them againſt* Theodorus *of* Mopſveſtia, *as yet living*; and againſt his writings, *ſcripſerunt adverſus eum Epiſtolas, they writ Epiſtles againſt him:* and in thoſe Epiſtles (ſome part whereof is recorded in the Councell) they blame him as preſuming to renew the hereſie and madneſſe of *Paulus Samoſatenus*. And it is further added, *porrecta ſunt autem*, and the impious chapters collected out of the books of *Theodorus, were ſhewed and brought to* Theophilus; whence it is now evident, that thoſe Epiſtles alleaged by *Vigilius* under the name of *Proclus*, are no leſſe, by the untrue, and hereticall aſſertions contained in them, then by the cleare teſtimonies of the fift generall Councell, convicted of forgery.

[y] *Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 545. a.*

30. From Fathers hee commeth to Councells, and concerning the firſt *Epheſine*. *Vigilius* noteth two points. The former that *Theodorus* was not condemned by it, to which purpoſe hee thus ſaith [z], *Solicite recenſentes, having with diligence, and ſollicitude reviewed the Epheſine Synode:* We have found that in it nothing is related touching the perſō of *Theodorus*. What, nothing? how then did Pope *Pelagius* [a] after *Cyrill*, and the fift Councell finde that in it *Theodorus* was condemned? and if they condemned him, then certainly ſomwhat was related, & debated about him, upon knowledge whereof the Councell condemned him. But ſay indeed, is nothing found concerning *Theodorus* in that Councell? What ſay you to the impious and diabolicall Creed, which was both related [b] in the Synode, and condemned [c] together with the author of it? Truely here *Vigilius* uſeth a ſhift, worthy to be obſerved. That Creed he found, and hee found it to be condemned: but to quite *Theodorus*, hee [d] would have it beleeved, that *Theodorus* was not the author of it; nor that it was condemned, as being the Creed of *Theodorus*, but becauſe it was divulged by certaine Neſtorians, *Athanaſius, Photius, Antonius*, and *Iacobus*. Nor doth *Vigilius* uſe this ſhift only about that impious Creed, but in other hereticall writings of *Theodorus*. *Proclus* adjoyned to his Tome certaine impious poſitions collected *è Theodori codicibus*, as *Cyrill* [e] expreſly witneſſeth. *Vigilius* likewiſe of them would have it thought, that they were none of the poſitions of *Theodorus*; and by the forged Epiſtles of *Proclus*, hee would perſwade [f] that *Proclus himſelfe did not know whoſe they were*. The Emperour *Iuſtinian* before the Synode began, ſent threeſcore ſeverall hereticall paſſages or chapters truly gathered out of the bookes and writings of *Theodorus*, hoping that

[z] *Vigil. Conſt nu. 173.*

[a] *Theodorum mortuum ſanctæ Synodus Epheſina damnavit. Pelag 2. Epiſt. 7. §. In his.*

[b] *Act. Epheſ. conc. to. 2. ca. 29, 30, 31, & 33.*

[c] *Hoc Symbolum una cum authore Epheſina prima Synodus anathematizavit. conc. 5. coll. 4. pa. 537. a.*

[d] *Sed Symbolum quod Chariſius prodidit (condemnatū) magis quia ab Athanaſio, Photio, &c. Vigil. conſt. nu. 173. ubi ſententia manca per dictionem (condemnatum) aut aliam ſimilē ſupplenda eſt.*

[e] *Cyrill Epiſtola ad Acatium, quæ citat. in conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 543.*

[f] *Mala quæ damnaverat, cujus eſſent, Proclus profeſſus eſt ſe ignorare. Vigil. conc. nu. 175.*

that the Pope, ſeeing *Theodorus* bookes ſo full fraught with hereſies, and blaſphemies, would make little doubt to condemne the writer of them. *Vigilius* turnes to his former ſhift, hee will not thinke, nor have others to thinke that *Theodorus* writ ſuch hereſies, though they had his name prefixed unto them: for concerning thoſe 60. chapters (expreſſed both in the Popes *Conſtitution* [g], and in the *Synodall* [h] *acts*) he thus ſaith [i], *Wee decree that by thoſe foreſaid chapters, nulla injuriandi præcedentes patres præbeatur occaſio: no occaſion be given to injure the former Fathers and Doctors of the Church.* And again [k], *We provide by this our Conſtitution*, that by theſe or the like doctrines condemned in *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches, no contumely, nor occaſion of injury bee brought to thoſe Biſhops who have died in the peace of the Catholike Church:* and that *Vigilius* thought *Theodorus* ſo to have dyed, we have before [l] declared: yea that *Vigilius* knew it, *Baronius* aſſured us. Thus *Vigilius* to free *Theodorus* from condemnation, pretends thoſe hereticall writings to be none of his.

g *Conc. Vig. anu. 60. ad nu. 173.*
h *Conc. 5. coll. 4.*
i *Vigil. in conſt. nu. 173.*
k *nu. 184.*
l *Sup. ca. 7.*

31. What is it that *Vigilius* will not ſay for defence of this blaſphemous and condemned heretike? This cavill was uſed, as *Baronius* [m] tells us, by the old Neſtorians and defenders of *Theodorus*, denying thoſe to bee the writings of *Theodorus, qua diffamata, which were famouſly knowne through the whole Eaſt:* and which being afterwards detected, and diſcovered to bee truly his writings, both they, and their author with them were condemned. Now this old hereticall and rejected cavill *Vigilius* here renewes, thoſe writings famouſly knowne to be the workes of *Theodorus*, condemned as his writings, and he with them and for thē, *Vigilius* will now have thought to be none of his, nor he by them nor for them may bee now condemned. And that you may ſee how *Vigilius* herein doth ſtrive againſt the maine ſtreame of the truth. Saint *Cyrill* [n] who then lived, teſtifieth *Theodorus* to be author of thoſe hereticall and blaſphemous writings. That wee have found certaine things in the writings of *Theodorus, nimiæ plena blaſphemiæ, nulli dubium eſt, full of blaſphemie, none that thinks aright can make any doubt.* And againe [o], I examining the bookes of *Theodorus*, and *Diodorus*, have contradicted them as much as I could, declaring that ſect to be every where full of abomination. Yea hee writ divers bookes [p] againſt *Theodorus*, expreſſing the words of *Theodorus* and his owne confutation of the ſame. So cleare, and undoubted was this truth in *Cyrills* dayes, who lived at the ſame time with *Theodorus*, that hee thought them unwiſe, who made any doubt of that, which *Vigilius* now calls in queſtion. And particularly touching that impious *Creed, Cyrill* ſaith [q], that they who brought it to the Synode of *Epheſus*, ſaid, *that it was compoſed by* Theodorus: which they ſaid not as by way of uncertaine report, but as teſtifying it to be ſo, in ſo much that the whole Synode giving credit thereunto, thereupon condemned *Theodorus* [r], though by a diſpenſation they expreſſed not his name.

m *Defenſores Theodori, ea ipſius ſcripta eſſe negarunt. Bar. an. 435. nu. 14.*
n *Cyrill. Epiſtola ad Proclum, citata in Conc. 5. coll. 5 pa. 55c. b.*
o *Ibid. pa. 550 a.*
p *Qui Cyrilli libri citantur ſæpe in Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 538. & ſeq.*
q *Prolata apud ſanctum Synodum expoſitione ab eo compoſita, ſicut dicebant, qui protulerunt, &c. Verba Cyrill. in Epiſt. ad Proclum citat. in Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 550 b.*
r *His condemnatis qui ſic ſapiunt, nullam viri (Theodori) memoriam fecerunt. Ibid.*

32 The

32 The ſame is teſtified by *Rambulas*, *Acatius*, and the whole *Armenian* Councell, who after examination [f] of this cauſe found the true and indubitate writings of *Theodorus* to be ſacrilegious: and therefore by name condemned him, exhorting both *Cyrill* and *Proclus* to doe the like. The *Imperiall* Edicts of *Theodoſius* [t], and *Valentinian* leave no ſcruple in this matter: who would never have ſo ſeverely forbidden the memory of *Theodorus*, and the reading or having of his bookes, had it not by evidences undeniable beene knowne, that thoſe were indeed his workes, and hereticall writings. If all theſe ſuffice not, when this cauſe about *Theodorus* was now againe brought into queſtion, the Emperour *Iuſtinian*, and the fift Councell, ſo narrowly and ſo exactly examined the truth hereof, that after them to make a doubt, is to ſeeke a knot in a ruſh. They teſtifie thoſe very hereticall aſſertions whereof *Vigilius* doubteth, to be the doctrines and words [u] of *Theodorus*, that impious creed alſo, whereof *Vigilius* is doubtfull to be compoſed by *Theodorus*: *they are ſo certaine* [x] *hereof*, that even in their Synodall ſentence [y], they referre the triall of what they decree herein to the true and undoubted bookes of *Theodorus*. And in their ſentence is included the judgement of the whole catholike Church, ever ſince they decreed this which hath with one conſent approved their decree.

33 After all theſe Pope *Pelagius*, in one of his decretall Epiſtles, wherein at large he handleth this cauſe, not onely teſtifieth that impious *Creed* [z], and thoſe hereticall [a] writings, to bee the workes of *Theodorus*, alleaging many places of them, but whereas ſome obſtinately addicted to the defence of the *three Chapters* moved againe [b] this ſame doubt which *Vigilius* doth; and as is likely by occaſion of his decree: *Pelagius* of purpoſe declareth thoſe [c] to have beene the true writings of *Theodorus*, and conſonant to his doctrine; and that hee proveth by the teſtimonies of the *Armenian* Biſhops, of *Proclus*, of *Iohn* of *Antioch*, of *Cyrill*, of *Rambulas*, of *Honoratus* a Biſhop of *Cilicia*, (and ſo a neighbor of *Mopſveſtia* which is in the ſame [d] Province,) of *Heſychius*, of *Theodoſius*, and *Valentinian* the Emperours, and of *Theodoret*, then whom not any (except perhaps *Neſtorius*) was more devoted to *Theodorus*; inſomuch that he is thought to have taken from *Theodorus* the name of *Theodoret*. After which cloud of witneſſes produced, *Pelagius* thus concludeth [e], *blaſphemias has ejus eſſe quis dubitat, who may doubt but that thoſe blaſphemies are truly his*, (namely of *Theodorus*,) being by ſo many witneſſes declared to be his? Now when Pope *Vigilius* againſt all theſe Councells, Biſhops, Emperors, Popes, of the ſame, of ſucceeding ages, yea againſt the conſenting judgement of the catholike Church, ſhall not onely doubt, whether *Theodorus* be the author of thoſe hereticall and blaſphemous aſſertions and writings: but by his *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution* decree it to bee an injury to aſcribe thoſe blaſphemies

f *Fiat unitas veſtra contra Theodorum, & ſacrilega capitula & dogmata ejus. Libell. Epiſc. Armen. ad Proclum. in Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 542. b.*

t *De quibus legibus ſupra, hoc cap. Extat vero in Conc. 5. coll. 5. pa. 544.*

u *Habemus quæ ex Theodori codicibus collegiſtu. Conc. 5. coll. 4. pa. 527. b. & idem docet Iuſtin. in ſuo Edict. § Si quis deſendit Theodorum.*

x *Impius Theodorus aliud Symbolum expoſuit. Iuſt. in Edicto. §. Tali, Et impium ejus (Theodori) Symbolum. coll. 4. pa. 537. a.*

y *Licet volentibus codices impij Theodori præ manibus accipere, vel quæ ex impijs codicibus ejus à nobis inſerta his geſtis ſunt. Conc. 5. coll. 8. pa. 585. a.*

z *Ab ejus (Theodori) diſcipulis, dictatum ab eo ſymbolum in eâdem Synodo Epheſina prolatum. Pelagius Epiſt. 7. §. In his.*

a *Ejuſdem Theodori ex libris illius dicta replicemus. ibid.*

b *Hæc Theodori dicta, utrum ejus ſint, fortaſſe dubitatur. ibid. §. Hæc.*

c *Ibidem. & ſeq.*

d *Secunda Cilicia, ſub qua Mopſveſtia conſtituta eſt. Conc 5. coll. 5. pa. 547. b.*

e *Epiſt. 7. §. Eiſi.*

blaſphemies unto him, or for them to condemne him, (as the whole Church, ever ſince the *Epheſine* Councell hath done) doth it not argue, nay demonſtrate an hereticall, and moſt extreme diſtemper in the Popes judgment, and in his cathedrall ſentence at that time.

34. The other point which *Vigilius* obſerveth out of the *Epheſine* Councel is worſe then this, for as yet he hath onely found that *Theodorus* was not *de facto* condemned by the *Epheſine* Synode; but in the next place, he will finde by that Councell, that *Theodorus*, *de jure* ought not to bee condemned. To which purpoſe he ſaith [f], that *Cyrill* (and ſo the *Epheſine* Synode conſenting to him as Preſident) would not have the name of *Theodorus* contained in the Synodall Acts at *Epheſus: propter regulam qua de mortuis in ſacerdotio ſervanda eſt, for the rule which is to bee kept in ſuch Biſhops as are dead.* And that rule he explaines in the words following, to be this, that the dead ſhould not bee condemned, nor ſhould the living bend their bow againſt aſhes, or inſult over the dead, whereby *Vigilius* even by his *Apoſtolicall* decree, adjudgeth both *Cyrill*, and the whole *Epheſine* Councell conſenting therein with him, to have beleeved and held a condemned hereſie, as an Eccleſiaſticall rule, or rule of their faith and actions; That one who is dead may not bee condemned: and ſo by the Popes *Conſtitution* both *Cyrill* and the holy *Epheſine* Synode were heretikes. Such worthy points doe the Popes finde when they uſe their art, and induſtry, to review ancient writings, with a reference to their owne determinations, and ſo eaſie was it for *Vigilius* to finde the *Epheſine* Councell, firſt injurious to the dead, and then hereticall in a doctrine or rule concerning the dead.

[f] *Vigilius in Conſt. nu. 173.*

35. The very like he found alſo in the Councell of *Chalcedon*, that *Theodorus* ought not to be condemned. His reaſon is this; *Iohn* [g] Biſhop of *Antioch*, writ a letter to the Emperor *Theodoſius* in excuſe of *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia, ne poſt mortem damnari deberet, that he ought not to bee condemned after his death.* Now this letter of *Iohn*, *Venerabiliter memoratur, is with honour*, (not onely with allowance and liking) *remembred by the Councell of Chalcedon*, in their Relation, or Synodall Epiſtle to the Emperour *Martianus*. Whence *Vigilius* collecteth, that ſeeing the Councell with reverence, embraceth that letter of *Iohn*, and that letter importeth, that *Theodorus* being dead, ought not to be condemned; therefore the Councell judgeth that none who are dead, and particularly, that *Theodorus* ought not to bee condemned: which reaſon of *Vigilius* was borrowed from other Neſtorians, and defenders of the *three Chapters*, as appeareth by *Liberatus*, who explaineth it, and ſets [h] it downe almoſt *totidem verbis*: *Iohn* ſaith he, writ three letters in the behalfe of *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia*, praiſing in them *Theodorus*, and declaring his wiſedome; one of thoſe letters he ſent to the Emperour *Theodoſius*, another

[g] *Vigil. in Conſt. nu. 145.*

[h] *Liber. ca. 10.*

to

to *Cyrill*, the third to *Proclus*. Now the first, and third, containing the praises of *Theodorus*, the Councell of *Chalcedon*, in their Relation to *Martianus* the Emperour, did [i] embrace, and confirme. Thus *Liberatus* agreeing wholly herein, as you see, with *Vigilius*.

i *Duas Iohannis Epistolas laudes Theodori continentes, Chalced. Synod. suscepit, et confirmavit. Ibid.*

36. For answer of which reason of *Vigilius*, I will intreat you to spare my labour, and heare how fully, and soundly Cardinall *Baronius* doth refute it; but yet so, that hee will not seeme to taxe, or touch *Vigilius*; that had beene great insolency, and incivilitie in a Cardinall; but he payes the Deacon home to the full, who saith but the very same with the Pope: *Liberatus*, saith [k] hee, *borrowed this narration of I know not what Nestorian, & incautè nimis*; and he affirmes too indiscreetly, that the writings of *Theodorus* were praised in the letters of *Iohn*, Bishop of *Antioch*; and, which is farre worse, that those letters of *Iohn*, containing the praises of *Theodorus*, were received, and confirmed by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, in their Relation to *Martianus*; for by that meanes, *adducit in idem crimen, he makes the whole Councell of Chalcedon guilty of the same crime*; to wit, of approving the praises & doctrine of *Theodorus*. So *Baronius*. By whō it is cleare, that *Vigilius* (saying the same w^th^ *Liberatus*) makes the whole Coūce l of *Chalcedon* guilty of the same crime; that is, in plaine termes avoucheth them to be hereticall: *Videsne*, saith the [l] Cardinall, *quot, & quales lateant colubri sub uno cespite? Doe not you see how many, and how vile, and venemous snakes lye hid under this one turfe*, or tuft of untruth? And that very tuft, hath Pope *Vigilius* chosen to build up, and beautifie with it his *Apostolicall* decree. Now, if under that one turfe there lurke (as indeed there doth, and the Cardinall acknowledgeth,) so great a number of Vipers; what infinite, and innumerable heapes of most deadly, and poisonfull untruths, are compacted into the whole body of his *Apostolicall* Constitution, which containeth (if one listed narrowly to examine it) more than a thousand like turfes; nay, beyond comparison worse than this.

k *Bar. an. 435. nu. 11.*

l *Ibid.*

37. But the Cardinall hath not yet done with *Liberatus*; Let us, saith [m] hee, put the Axe to the roote of the tree; and citing the very words of the Councell, and their Relation to *Martianus*, he addeth, You see that here is no mention at all of *Theodorus* of *Mopsvestia*; which reason of *Baronius*, *Binius* [n] explaneth, saying, *That which Liberatus affirmeth, that the Councell of Chalcedon received the praises of* Theodorus, is not onely untroue, *sed etiam ipsi relationi Synodicæ contraria*; *but it is plainly contrary to the Synodall Relation of the Councell at Chalcedon*, to which *Liberatus* referreth himselfe: Change but the name, and all this is everie whit as forcible against *Vigilius*, as against *Liberatus*. But the Cardinall had well learned the old lesson, *Dat veniam corvis vexat censura columbas*; the Pope offends more than any, but the poore Deacon must feele the smart, and beare all the blowes; and yet by

m *Bar. ibid. et nu. 12.*

n *Bin. Notis in liberatum. § Breviarium hoc.*

your leave, through the Deacons sides the Cardinall hath cunningly given a deadly wound, and cut the very roote of the Popes *Apostolicall* decree; although he will not bee thought so unmannerly, as once to touch his Holinesse, or speake one syllable against him.

38. After Fathers, and Councels, *Vigilius* will next finde, that the Emperour *Iustinian* himselfe, who was so earnest in condemning *Theodorus*, doth yet teach, that *Theodorus* ought not to bee condemned; and how proves hee this? You, saith [o] *Vigilius* to the Emperour, *laudabiliter adduxistis, have with praise and approbation alleaged* that Relation of the Councell of *Chalcedon* in your law, *de sancta Trinitate*. Seeing then that Relation of the Councell approveth the letters of *Iohn*, and the letters of *Iohn*, shew, that *Theodorus* being dead, ought not to bee condemned; the Pope from hence inferreth, that by *Iustinians* own law approving that Relation, *Theodorus* ought not to be condemned. It were very easie with *Baronius* Hatchet to chop off this reason, and cut it up by the roote, seeing neither *Iohns* letters did teach that *Theodorus*, being dead, might not be condemned; nor did the Councell, in their Relation approve, either the person, or doctrine, or any praises of *Theodorus*, or so much as mention him: But I will not trouble the Cardinall in so easie a matter as this. Besides all the inconsequences in this reason, *Iustinian* is so farre from teaching, or thinking this, so much as in a dreame, that in the same title, [p] *de Summa Trinitate, & fide Catholica*, (which seemes to be that which *Vigilius* intended) he accurseth all heresies, and specially that of *Nestorius*; and all, *qui eadem cum ipso sentiunt, vel senserunt; who either doe thinke, or have thought as Nestorius did*; in which number *Theodorus* of *Mopsvestia* to be comprehended, not onely by that which we have said before, is manifest; but even by *Iustinian* himselfe, who expresly witnesseth, Theodorus [q] *to have thought so, and to have* [r] *dyed in that hereticall opinion; and for that very cause doth he condemne, and accurse him.* Now seeing that law, *de Summa Trinitate*, was published in the seventh yeare of *Iustinians* raigne, (as by the [s] date appeareth) and sent into twelve severall Provinces; seeing, after this, *Iustinian*, in his twentieth [t] yeare, set forth another Edict [u] concerning these *three Chapters*, wherein he particularly, and by name anathematizeth [y] *Theodorus*; nor him onely, but all that defend him; yea, all, who doe not anathematize him; out of which number *Vigilius* himselfe is not exempted, seeing he remained so constant in this truth, that after *Vigilius* had published his *Constitution*, both himselfe signified to the fift Councell, that he still persisted in condemning the *three Chapters*, one of which was the condemning of *Theodorus*; and the whole fift Synod testified the same, saying in their seventh Collation, *semper* [z] *fecit, & facit, the Emperour hath ever done, and now continueth to doe, that which preserveth the holy Church, and true faith*: Was it not a very strange thing in *Vigilius* to pretend in his *Constitution*, that by the Empe-

o *In Const. nu. 175.*

p *In Cod. Iust. leg. 6. tit. de summa Trin.*

q *Theodorus hereticos omnes impietate superat, &c. Iust. in edict. § Tali.*

r *Iste autem (Theodorus) usque ad mortem in sua permanens impietate. Ibid. § Quod autem.*

s *Datum Iustiniano Augusto 3. Coss. Is vero est annus 7. Iustiniani, ut docet Marcell. in Chrō. et Bar. in eum an. nu. 1.*

t *Vt ait Bar. an. 546 nu. 8.*

u *Edictum hoc de quo toties mentionem fecimus.*

y *Iust. Edict. § Si quis defendit Theodorum.*

z *Pa. 582. b.*

rours owne law, *Theodorus* ought not be condemned; whereas by the Emperours Edict, not onely *Theodorus* by name, but all, who defend him, even *Vigilius* himſelfe, *eo nomine*, becauſe he defendeth him, is condemned, and anathematized.

39. And now you have ſeene all that *Vigilius* bringeth for defence of *Theodorus*, all that hee found after his moſt diligent ſearch of the Fathers, Councels, and ancient writings; whereby I doubt not but it is evident unto all, that Neſtorianiſme had either quite blinded the Pope, or at leaſt induced him to play (which he hath done very skilfully) one of the *Lamia* in this cauſe; when ought that tended to the truth, came in his way, and offered it ſelfe unto him, he then lockt up his eyes, and kept them faſt in a basket; but when, or where ought that tended to Neſtorianiſme, and the defence of a condemned heretike, might in a likelihood be found; then he put his eyes in his head, and became as quickſighted, as the Serpent of *Epidaurus*. The writings of *Cyril*, and *Proclus*, condemning *Theodorus* for an heretike, worſe than either Iew, or Pagan, the Councels of *Epheſus*, of *Armenia*, of *Chalcedon*, anathematizing him; the Imperiall lawes of *Theodoſius*, commanding all memory of him to bee aboliſhed, & his heretical books to be burned; the expunging his name out of the Eccleſiaſticall tables, even in that Church, where hee had beene Biſhop; and a number the like; none of all theſe could *Vigilius*, in his moſt diligent inquiſition, finde or ſee: why, the *Lamia* had lockt up his eyes againſt all theſe publike, and known evidences, and records. But when the baſe Counterfeits, forged in the name of *Cyrill*, and *Proclus*; when the depraving, or calumniating the Councels of *Epheſus*, of *Chalcedon*, and of *Iuſtinian*, as being maintainers of a condemned hereſie: when theſe, or the like might be found, oh the Pope ſaw theſe at the firſt; his eyes were now as cleare, as the ſight of *Linceus*, he could ſpie theſe through a Milſtone; nay, which is more, hee could ſee them, though there were no ſuch matters at all to bee ſeene: And truly, if you well conſider, there was good reaſon why hee ſhould ſee the one, and not the other. For the Pope ſaw the Epiſtle of *Ibas* to bee orthodoxall, and to be approved by the Councell of *Chalcedon*; he ſaw in that Epiſtle *Theodorus* to be called a [a] Saint, a Preacher of the truth, a Doctor of the Church; Now it had beene an exceeding incongruity, to ſee a condemned Saint, an accurſed Saint, an hereticall, or blaſphemous Saint; It was not for the Popes wiſedome to ſee ſuch a Saint, and therefore at all ſuch ſights, up with the eyes, locke them faſt, that they ſee none of thoſe ugly, and offenſive ſights; nothing of the condemning, of the accurſing, of the hereſies, and blaſphemies of *Theodorus*. So bewitched was the Pope with Neſtorianiſme at this time, that it had the whole command of his heart, of his eyes, of his ſenſe, of his underſtanding; it opened, and ſhut them all whenſoever it liſted.

[a] *Quorum unus eſt beatus Theodorus veritatis prædicator, et doctor Eccleſiæ. Epiſt. Ibæ in Conc. Chal. Act. 10. pa. 113. b.*

40. I have ſtayed too long, I feare, in examining this *firſt Chapter*, touching *Theodorus*; but I was very loath to let any materiall point paſſe, without due triall, or before I had ſhaken aſunder every joint, and parcell of the Popes *Conſtitution* in this cauſe, and fully manifeſted, how erronious his *Apoſtolicall* decree is, as well in *doctrinall*, as *perſonall* matters. That *Theodorus* was dead, is *perſonall*; but that none after death may bee condemned for an heretike, is *doctrinall*; yea, an hereſie in the doctrine of faith. That *Theodorus* dyed in the peace of the Church, is an errour *perſonall*; but that *Theodorus* therefore dyed in the peace of the Church, becauſe he was not in his life time condemned by the expreſſe ſentence of the Church; or, that any dying in hereſie, as *Theodorus* did, doe die in the peace of the Church, are errours *doctrinall*. That *Theodorus* was not by the former Fathers, and Councels condēned, is a *perſonall* error; but that *Theodorus* by the judgement of the Fathers, & Councels, ought not after his death to be condemned, is *doctrinall*; even a condemning of the Councels of *Epheſus*, and *Chalcedon*, as guilty of beleeving, and teaching an hereſie. So many wayes is the Popes ſentence, in this *firſt Chapter*, erronious in faith; of which *Baronius* moſt vainely pretendeth, that it is no cauſe of faith, no ſuch cauſe as doth concerne the faith.

41. There now remaineth nothing of *Vigilius* decree concerning this *firſt Chapter*, but his concluſion of the ſame: And although that muſt needs of it ſelfe fall downe, when all the reaſons, on which it relyeth, and by which onely it is ſupported, are ruinated, or overthrowne; yet if you pleaſe, let us take a ſhort view of it alſo, rather to explane, than refute the ſame. His concluſion hath two branches, the former is, that in regard of the foreſaid reaſons, *noſtrâ* [b] *eum non audemus damnare ſententia*; *wee dare not condemne* Theodorus *by our ſentence*, wee dare not doe it, ſaith *Vigilius*.

b *Vig. Conſt. nu. 179*

42. Oh how faint-hearted, puſillanimous, and daſtardly was the Pope in this cauſe; *Cyrill*, the [c] head of the generall Councell: *Proclus*, a moſt [d] holy Biſhop, whoſe Epiſtle, as *Liberatus* [e] ſaith, the Councell of *Chalcedon* approved: *Rambulas*, the piller of the Church: the religious Emperours *Theodoſius*, and *Valentinian*; the Church of *Mopſveſtia*, the Councels of *Epheſus*, of *Armenia*, of *Chalcedon*, the whole Catholike Church ever ſince the *Epheſine* Synod, both durſt, and did condemne *Theodorus*: and, beſides theſe, *Baronius*, and *Binius*, two of the moſt artificiall Gnathonizing Paraſites of the Pope, even they durſt, and did, even in ſetting downe the very *Conſtitution* of *Vigilius*, cal [f] *Theodorus*, more than forty times, an heretike, a craftie, impious, madde, prophane, blaſphemous, execrable heretike; onely Pope *Vigilius* hath not the heart, nor courage; hee onely with his ſectators, dare not call him, nor cōdemne him for an heretike; we dare not condemne him by our ſentence.

c *Sanctiſſimorum Epiſcoporum hic coactorum caput Cyrillum, &c. Epiſt. Synod. Epheſ. to. 4. Act. Conc. Epheſ. ca. 8.*

d *Cyrill. epiſt. ad Acac. in Con. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 543. a. Dominus meus ſanctiſſimus Epiſcopus Proclus.*

e *Lib. ca. 10.*

f *Rurſumq; hæreticus, blaſphemus, &c. Bar. an. 553. nu. 120. et ſeq. et Bin. pa. 595. et ſeq.*

43. And

43. And yet when *Vigilius* ſaw good, hee who durſt not doe this, durſt doe a greater matter, he durſt doe that which not any of all the former, nay which they all put together, never durſt doe. *Vigilius* durſt defend both an hereſie, and a condemned and anathematized heretike, he durſt commend forged, and hereticall writings, under the name of holy Fathers, hee durſt approve that Epiſtle, wherein an heretike is called, and honoured for a Saint; he durſt, contrary to the Imperiall and godly Edict of *Theodoſius*, contrary to the judgements of the holy generall Councells, defend *Theodorus*, honor his memorie, yea honor him as a teacher of truth while he lived, as a Saint being dead; Theſe things none of all the former ever durſt doe: in theſe *Vigilius* is more bold and audacious then they are all.

44. Whence thinke you proceeded this contrariety of paſſions in *Vigilius*, that made him ſometimes more bold then a Lyon, and other times more timerous then an Hare? Truely even from hence: As *Vigilius* had no eyes to ſee ought, but what favored Neſtorianiſme, ſo hee had not the heart to doe ought which did not uphold Neſtorianiſme. If a Catholike truth met him, or the ſweet influence thereof hapned to breath upon him, *Vigilius* could not endure it, the Popes heart fainted at the ſmell thereof: but when the Neſtorian hereſie blew upon him, when being full with *Neſtorius* he might ſay, *agitante caleſcimus illo*, not *Ajax*, not *Poliphemus* ſo bold nor full of courage as Pope *Vigilius*. As the Scarobee or beetle [g] is ſaid to feed on dung, but to dye at the ſent of a Roſe; So the filth of Neſtorianiſme was meat, and drinke to the Pope, it was *vita vitalis* unto him; but the fragrant and moſt odoriferous ſent of the catholike truth, was poiſon, it was even death to this Beetle. So truly was it fulfilled in him, which the Prophet ſaith [h], *they bend their tongues for lyes, but they have no courage for the truth*: we dare not condemne *Theodorus* by our ſentence.

[g] *Pier. Hier. lib. 55.*

[h] *Jer. 9. 3.*

45. The other branch of the Popes concluſion is, *Sed* [i] *nec ab alio quopiam condemnari concedimus, neither doe wee permit that any other ſhall condemne* Theodorus: Nay we decree [k] that none elſe ſhall ſpeake, write, or teach otherwiſe, then we doe herein. As much in effect, as if the Pope had definitively decreed, wee permit, or ſuffer no man whatſoever, to teach or beleeve what *Cyrill*, what *Proclus*, what the whole generall Councells of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*: that is, what all Catholikes, and the whole Catholike Church hath done, taught and beleeved: we permit, nay we command, and by this our *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution*, decree, that they ſhall be heretikes, and defend both an hereſie, (that no dead man may be condemned) and condemned heretikes, in defending *Theodorus*, yea defending him for a Saint, and teacher of truth: This we permit, command, and decree, that they ſhall doe; but to doe otherwiſe, to condemne *Theodorus*, or a dead man, that by no meanes doe we permit or ſuffer it to bee lawfull unto them.

[i] *Vig. Conſt. nu. 179*

[k] *Vig. Conſt. nu. 208*

46. And as if all this were not ſufficient, the Pope addes one other clauſe more execrable, then all the former; for having recited thoſe threeſcore hereticall aſſertions, which as we have declared, were all collected out of the true, and indubitate writings of *Theodorus*, he adjoynes, [1] *Anathematizamus omnem, wee accurſe and anathematize every man pertaining to orders,* who ſhall aſcribe or impute any contumely, to the Fathers, and Doctors of the Church, by thoſe forenamed impieties: and if no Father, then not *Theodorus* for thoſe may be condemned. See now, unto what height of impiety, the Pope is aſcended, for it is as much as if hee had ſaid, We anathematize, and accurſe Saint *Cyrill*, Saint *Proclus*, Saint *Rambulas*, Saint *Acatius*, the Synode of *Armenia*, the generall Councells of *Epheſus*, of *Chalcedon*, of *Conſtantinople* in the time of *Iuſtinian*; yea even the whole catholike Church, which hath approved thoſe holy Councells: all theſe out of thoſe very impieties, which *Vigilius* mentioneth, have condemned *Theodorus*, them all for wronging, and condemning *Theodorus* for thoſe impieties, we doe anathematize, and accurſe, ſaith *Vigilius*.

1 *Vig Conſt. nu.* 173.

47. Conſider now ſeriouſly with your ſelves of what faith and religion they are, who hold (and ſo doe all the members of the preſent Romane Church,) this for a poſition or foundation of faith, that whatſoever any Pope doth judicially, and by his *Apoſtolike* authority define in ſuch cauſes, is true, is infallible, is with certainty of faith to bee beleeved and embraced: Let all the reſt be omitted, embrace but this one decree of *Vigilius*, nay but this one paſſage or parcell of his decree touching this *firſt Chapter* which concernes *Theodorus*; yet by approving this one, they demonſtrate themſelves, not onely to renounce, but with *Vigilius* to condemne, accurſe, and anathematize both the Catholike faith, and the Catholike Church: yea to accurſe all who doe not accurſe them, which becauſe none but *Anti-Chriſt*, and his hereticall adherents can doe, they demonſtrate againe hereby their Church to bee hereticall, cata-catholike, and Anti-Chriſtian, ſuch as not onely hateth, but accurſeth the holy, and truly Catholike Church of Chriſt. *But the curſe* [m] *that is cauſleſſe ſhall not come.* Nay, God doth, and for ever will turne their curſings into bleſſings. *Bleſſed are* [n] *yee, when for my ſake,* (for profeſſing and maintaining my truth) *men revile you, and ſpeake evill of you.* Let *Balak* hire with houſ-fulls of gold: Let the Romane *Balaam* for the wages of iniquity attempt never ſo oft, on this hill, on that mountaine, or whereſoever hee ſets up his altars to curſe the Church of GOD, *the Lord* [o] *will turne the curſe into a bleſſing unto them:* for, *there is no ſorcery* [p] *againſt Iacob, no curſe, no charme, nor incantation, againſt Iſraell.* Nay their curſes ſhall fall on their owne heads and returne into their owne boſomes, but peace, and the bleſſings of peace ſhall bee upon Iſrael. For

m *Prov.* 26. 2.

n *Mat.* 5. 11.

o *Deut.* 23. 5.

p *Numb.* 23. 23.

Bleſſed

bleſſed [q] *ſhall hee bee that bleſſeth thee, and curſed is hee that curſeth thee.* [q] Numb. 24. 9.

CHAP. IX.

That Vigilius *beſides divers perſonall, held a doctrinall errour in faith, in his defence of the* ſecond Chapter, *which concernes the writings of* Theodoret *againſt* Cyrill.

1.  Here was ſome ſhadow of reaſon to thinke, that the former Chapter was a perſonall matter; ſeeing that was indeed moved concerning the perſon of *Theodorus*. But in the two other, there is no pretence, or colour for *Baronius* to ſay, that in them the queſtion, or cauſe was perſonall, and not wholy doctrinall; who in all the fift Councell once doubted of the perſons of *Theodoret*, or *Ibas*, whether they were Catholikes, after their anathematizing of *Neſtorius* in the Councell of *Chalcedon*? The onely queſtion about them was, whether the writings of *Theodoret* againſt *Cyrill* were to bee condemned, which the Pope denyeth, and the holy Councell affirmeth, and whether the Epiſtle of *Ibas* was Orthodoxall, or he by it known to be Orthodoxal, which the Pope affirmeth, and the holy Councell denyeth. The queſtion about them, no way concerned their perſons, but onely their writings. And it might be a wonder that *Baronius* ſhould have the face to ſay, that the cauſe in theſe *two Chapters* was onely perſonall, if it were not daily ſeene by experience that *neceſſitas cogit ad turpia*, mere neceſſity enforced the Cardinall to uſe any though never ſo untrue, never ſo unlikely excuſes for *Vigilius*.

2. There are I confeſſe divers perſonall matters, and queſtions of facts, which concernes both theſe Chapters: and although they were not the controverſies moved, and debated, betwixt the defenders, and the oppugners of thoſe Chapters; yet is it needfull to ſay ſomewhat of them alſo; partly for more illuſtration of the cauſe of faith, & ſpecially that we may ſee how foully *Vigilius* and *Baronius* have erred, not onely in doctrinall cauſes, which are more obſcure, but even in thoſe perſonall matters, which had beene eaſie, and obvious, if they had not ſhut their eyes againſt the truth.

3. Concerning the *ſecond Chapter*, the Popes decree herein relyeth, and is grounded, on three perſonall points, or matters of fact. The firſt is, that *Vigilius* would perſwade, that *Theodoret* was not the author of thoſe writings againſt *Cyrill*, and againſt his twelve Chapters or Anathematizmes [a], which containing a juſt condemnation of the twelve hereticall aſſertions of *Neſtorius*,

[a] *Extant in Actis Conc. Epheſ. to. 1. ca. 14. et tom. 5. ca. 1.*

b Ibid. to. 5. ca. 2. §. Ego vero. Et Liber. ca. 6.
c Act. 5. in definit. fidei.
d Vigil. Conſtit. nu. 180.
e Ibid. nu. 181.
f Ibid.

rius, were approved both by the Councell of *Epheſus* [b], and *Chalcedon* [c]. To which purpoſe he calls them not *Theodorets*, but writings, *quæ* [d] *ſub Theodoreti nomine proferuntur, which are ſet forth under the name of Theodoret*. And againe, the reproſe of the 12. Chapters of *Cyrill*: *à Theodoreto* [e] *ut putatur ingeſta, made as is thought by Theodoret*: adding [f] this as one reaſon, why the Councell of *Chalcedon*, did not cõdemne thoſe writings, becauſe they having thoſe matters which were done but of late before their eyes, *Theodoretum nihil tale feciſſe probaverunt, did judge that Theodoret had written no ſuch thing*. Thus *Vigilius* pretending thoſe writings againſt *Cyrill* not to be *Theodorets*, and that the Councell of *Chalcedon* alſo thought the ſame: whence he would inferre, (and juſtly upon this ſuppoſall) that *Theodorets* name ought not to bee blemiſhed by thoſe writings which were none of his.

4. Not his? why *Theodoret* is knowne, and teſtified by ſo many, to have beene ſo eager and violent in defence of *Neſtorius*, and his hereſie, and ſo ſpitefull both in words, and writings againſt *Cyrill*, and all orthodoxall profeſſors of that time, that it were more ſtrange if *Vigilius* was ignorant of this, then that knowing it he ſhould deny, or make a doubt thereof. Witneſſe *Binius*, *Iohn* of *Antioch*, ſaith he, [g] *perſwaded* Theodoret, *that hee ſhould with all his art and skill oppugne and refute thoſe* 12 *Anathematizmes of Cyrill. Theodoret* being as much an enemy to *Cyrill*, as was *Iohn* himſelfe, willingly yeelded to his petition, and by manifeſt ſycophancy wreſted every one of *Cyrills* Chapters from their true, genuine, and orthodoxall, to a falſe, prepoſterous, and hereticall ſenſe, and *Enoptius* ſent that refutation of *Theodoret* unto *Cyrill*. Againe, [h] *Theodoret* did once defend *Theodorus* and *Neſtorius*, two moſt peſtiferous Arch-heretikes againſt *Cyrill*. Yea *Binius* ſaith, *defendit conſtantiſſimè, he defended them moſt constantly*, as if to defend hereſie, were with theſe men not pertinacie, but conſtancy, witneſſe *Baronius*. *Theodoret* ſaith he [i] *being moſt addicted to Theodorus, ſhadowed his praiſe, by his friendſhip with Neſtorius, but he utterly darkned it by his undertaking of the defence of that Arch-heretike againſt Cyrill*. And againe [k], *Theodoret being at that time the patron of Neſtorius, and an oppugner of the Catholike faith, throweth his darts againſt the Chapters of Cyrill, and by new writings doth oppugne them*; crying out in his letters to the Biſhops of *Millaine* of *Aquileia*, and of *Ravenna*, that *Cyrill* renewed the hereſie of *Apollinaris*.

g Bin. in argumento ca. 2. Append. ad to. 5. Act. Conc. Epheſ. pa. 859.
h Bin. notis in Epiſt. Leonis. 61. to. 1. Conc. pa. 971.
i Bar. an. 427. nu. 30.
k an. 431. nu. 182.

5. Witneſſe (men of better note then the former) *Liberatus*, who ſaith, [l] that *Iohn of Antioch commanded two Biſhops, Andreas & Theodoret, that they ſhould write againſt the* 12. *Chapters of Cyrill, blaming him as one who renewed the hereſie of Apollinaris*: and that *Theodoret* conſented, the event made manifeſt. Pope *Pelagius*, who ſaith [m] that *Theodoret, monſtratur ſcripſiſſe, is demonſtrated and certainly knowne to have written againſt the twelve Chapters of Cyrill, and againſt the true Faith*.

l Liber. ca. 4.
m Pelag. 2. Epiſt. 7. §. Diſcuſſo.

The

The Acts of the *Epheſine* Councell, wherein [n] is recorded the verie refutation of thoſe twelve Chapters by *Theodoret*, and the anſwere of *Cyrill* unto it, the one ſtill called, *Theodoreti reprehenſio*; and the other, *Cyrilli adverſus Theodoretum refutatio*; *Cyrill*, who, in his Epiſtle [o] to *Eulogius*, ſaith thus, *You have my refutation which I ſet forth againſt Andreas, and Theodoret, who writ againſt my Chapters.*

n *Reprehenſio 12. Capitulorum, divi Cyrilli à Theodoreto conſcripta, habetur in Append. ad to. 5. Act. Conc. Eph. ca. 2. pa. 859. b*

o *Cyrill. Epiſt. ad Eulog. extat. to. 5. Act. Conc. Eph. c. 8.*

6. Witneſſe *Theodoret* himſelfe, who, in ſundrie of his Epiſtles, teſtifieth his ſpleene, and ſpight againſt *Cyrill*, and the Catholike faith. In [p] one of them to *Neſtorius* he profeſſeth his moſt perverſe, and pertinacious reſolution to abide in that hereſie of *Neſtorius*; *I will never*, ſaith he, *while I live, conſent to thoſe things which are done againſt you, and againſt the law*: (ſo hee taxeth, not onely the Chapters of *Cyrill*, but the decree of the holy *Epheſine* Synod) no, I will not conſent unto them, though they ſhould cut off both my hands. In another to *Iohn*, the Biſhop of *Antioch*; We [q] continue ſtill, ſaith he, contradicting the twelve Chapters, *ut alienis à pietate, as being contrary to pietie*: In another to *Æmerius*, *Wee* [r] *ought not to conſent to the condemnation of the venerable, and moſt holy Biſhop Neſtorius*: in another to [s] *Alexander*, *I told you before, that the doctrine of my venerable, and moſt holy Biſhop Neſtorius hath beene condemned, nec ego, cum his qui faciunt, communicabo, neither will I communicate with thoſe who condemned that doctrine*: and yet more bitterly in his Epiſtle to [t] *Andreas*, his fellow-oppugner of thoſe Chapters. *Inſanit iterum Ægyptus adverſus Deum, Ægypt is againe madde againſt the Lord*, and makes warre with *Moſes*, and *Aaron*, the ſervants of God: As if *Neſtorius*, and his fellow-heretikes were the onely Iſrael; but *Cyrill*, Biſhop of *Alexandria* in *Ægypt*; and the holy *Epheſine* Councell, and all Catholikes who held with them, were no other but *Pharao*, and his Ægyptian troupes, which fought againſt GODS people.

p *Extat in Conc. 5. coll. 5 pa. 559 a.*

q *Extat et citat. ib.*

r *Ea citatur à Pelagio, Epiſt. 7 § Diſcuſſo.*

s *Citatur ibid.*

t *Extat in Conc 5. Coll. 5. pa. 558. b.*

7. Doe we yet deſire more, or more pregnant, and ample teſtimonies in this matter? Take this one out of the acts of *Chalcedon*: When *Theodoret*, being called, came firſt into the Synod, the moſt reverend Biſhops of *Ægypt*, *Illirium*, and [u] *Paleſtine*, cryed out againſt him in this manner; The Canons exclude this man, thruſt him out, *Magiſtrum Neſtorij foras mittite; thruſt out the maſter of Neſtorius*: the orthodoxall Councell doth not receive *Theodoret*: *Call him not a Biſhop, he is no Biſhop, hee is an oppugner of God, he is a Iew, thruſt him out*: *he accuſed, he anathematized Cyrill; If we receive him, we reject Cyrill; The Canons exclude him, God doth deteſt him.* Thus cryed out the Biſhops againſt *Theodoret*, before they knew him to have renounced the hereſie of *Neſtorius*, which he had ſo long, and ſo eagerly defended: nor were they pacified otherwiſe, but that *Theodoret*, at the appointment of the Iudges, ſhould ſit onely as an accuſer of *Dioſcorus*, not as one having judicatorie power, or a deciſive ſuffrage, till his owne cauſe

u *Conc. Chal. Act. 1 pa. 6. a.*

cauſe was fully examined, and heard. Seeing now there are beſides, many other which I willingly omit, ſo many, ſo evident, ſo obvious, ſo undeniable prooſes, that *Theodoret* writ againſt *Cyrill*, and againſt his twelve Chapters, in defence of *Neſtorius*, and his hereſie; what can one thinke of *Vigilius*, but that he wilfully, and wittingly reſiſted the truth, while he, not onely ſtrives to perſwade, that *Theodoret* writ no ſuch thing, and that the Councell of *Chalcedon* thought ſo; but takes this knowne, and palpable untruth, for one of the grounds of his *Apoſtolicall* decree touching this *ſecond Chapter*.

8. And yet there is a worſe matter in this very paſſage of *Vigilius*, and that is, the reaſon whereby he proveth, that *Theodoret* writ not againſt *Cyrill*, or in defence of *Neſtorius*; you ſhall heare it in his owne words: *It is*, ſaith [x] he, *undoubtedly repugnant to the judgement of the Councell of Chalcedon, that any Neſtorian doctrines ſhould be condemned under the name of that Biſhop* (Theodoret) *who, together with thoſe holy Fathers, did accurſe the doctrines of Neſtorius: Quid enim aliud eſt mendaces, & ſimulantes profeſſionem rectæ fidei patres in ſancto Concilio Chalcedonenſi reſidentes oſtendere, quam dicere aliquos ex ijs ſimilia ſapuiſſe* Neſtorio: *for to ſay, that any of them who were in that Councell, had thought as* Neſtorius *did, is nothing elſe then to ſhew or affirme thoſe Fathers in the Councell of Chalcedon to be lyers, and diſſemblers in faith, as condemning that faith which they doe allow.* Thus reaſoneth *Vigilius*, who hence implyeth, that ſeeing *Theodoret* was one of the Biſhops, and Fathers at *Chalcedon*, if he ever writ any ſuch things in defence of *Neſtorius*, then both he, and the reſt admitting him, ſhould diſſemble in their faith, and lye; profeſſing to condemne *Neſtorius*, and yet approving him, who had writ in defence of *Neſtorius*.

x *Vigil. Conſt. nu.* 180.

9. Truly I doe even admire, to conſider the blindneſſe of *Vigilius* in this whole cauſe of the *three Chapters*. Moſt certaine it is, as we have ſhewed, that *Theodoret* did both thinke as *Neſtorius*, and write in defence of him, and his hereſie, and that the Councell of *Chalcedon* knew he did ſo: If then to receive ſuch an one, as they knew *Theodoret* to have beene, be, as *Vigilius* ſaith, a diſſembling, and lying in the faith; the whole Councell of *Chalcedon*, by the Popes judgement, and decree, were undoubtedly all lyers, and diſſemblers in the faith; a calumnie and ſlander ſo vile, and incredible, that it alone ſhould cauſe any Catholike minde to deteſt this *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution* of *Vigilius*: But to ſay truth, the Popes reaſon is without al reaſon. Had the holy Coũcell admitted *Theodoret* before he had renounced his hereſie, or manifeſted the ſincerity of his faith unto them, the Pope might have had ſome colour to have accuſed them of diſſembling, as condemning Neſtorianiſme, & yet receiving a known Neſtorian into their communion: but it was quite contrary. In the former actions, till *Theodoret* had cleared himſelfe of hereſie, hee was, as we have declared, no otherwiſe admitted, than onely as *a plaintiffe*,

tiſſe, who [y] *accuſed Dioſcorus for injuriouſly depoſing him, and placing another in his See.* And in the eight Action, wherein hee came to cleare himſelfe, and to be reconciled to the Church, he had no ſooner almoſt ſet his foot in the Synod, but the Biſhops cryed [z] out, Theodoretus *modo anathematizet* Neſtorium; *let* Theodoret *forthwith anathematize* Neſtorius: let him doe it inſtantly and without any delay. And when *Theodoret* to give the Councell better ſatisfaction offered them firſt a book to reade containing the ſincere profeſſion of his faith; and when (that being [a] refuſed) he purpoſed at large by words [b] to have expreſſed the ſame; the Synod ſuſpecting the worſt, and that hee uſed thoſe delayes, as being loath to anathematize *Neſtorius*, cryed out, *He is an heretike, he is a Neſtorian, hæreticum foras mitte, out with the heretike*; and ſo they had indeed thruſt him out, but that he leaving all circuition, preſently before them all, cryed, *Anathema* to *Neſtorius*; *Anathema* to him, who doth not confeſſe the bleſſed Virgin to bee the Mother of God: with which profeſſion the Synod being fully ſatisfied, the glorious Iudges ſaid, *omnis dubitatio*, now all doubt is quite taken away concerning *Theodoret*; and then the Synod both received him into their communion, as an orthodoxe, and reſtored him to his See, from which in the Epheſine latrocinie, hee was depoſed, they all crying out, *Theodoret* is worthy of his See; let his Church receive their orthodoxall Biſhop: To *Theodoret*, a Catholike Doctor, let the Church be reſtored.

y *Glorioſiſſ. Iudices dixerunt, Theodoretus in locum accuſatoris nunc ingreſſus eſt, unde patiamini ea quæ inchoata ſunt finiri, reſervata poſt hæc omni accuſatione, et vobis, et illi. Conc. Chal. Act. 1. pa. 6. a.*

z *Act. 8. Conc. Chal.*

a *Nihil relegi volumus, anathematizet Neſtorium. Ib.*

b *Ego (inquit Theoretus) quomodo erudo, &c. Ibid.*

10. What greater deteſtation of hereſie could the Synod poſſibly ſhew, what greater tokens of the ſinceritie of his faith, could either *Theodoret* expreſſe, or the Synod require. It was too great raſhneſſe, if not ſimplicitie in *Vigilius* to collect that the holy Councell did diſſemble in their faith, becauſe they received him who had ſometimes ſwarved in the faith; The hereticall *Theodoret*, they exclude and reject, the orthodoxall *Theodoret* they reverence and embrace. That which Saint *Auſten* [c] ſaith in another cauſe, *that the husband who had put away his adulterous wife, ought againe to receive her being purged by unfained repentance*, but ſo receive her, *non ut poſt viri divortium adultera revocetur, ſed ut poſt Chriſti conſortium adultera non vocetur*, that ſame may bee accommodated to any other offence, and not unfitly to this of hereſie, and the repentant hereticke; whom they before, for that cauſe had from themſelves diſioyned; but they neither call, nor count him an hereticke, whom Chriſt hath now upon his repentance unto himſelfe conjoyned. So neither is the Popes reaſon conſequent, that the Councell did diſſemble in their receiving of *Theodoret*, nor his concluſion true, which he would thence inferre, that *Theodoret* writ not againſt *Cyrill* and the Catholike faith.

c *Aug. lib. 2. de Adulter. conjug. ca. 9.*

11 The ſecond perſonall matter which *Vigilius* taketh for another ground of his decree is, that neither *Theodoret* himſelfe did, nor did the Councell of *Chalcedon*, require him to anathematize

matize his writings: *There was*, saith he, *divers in the Councell of Chalcedon who said, that* Theodoret *had anathematized Cyrill, and was an heretike*; yet those holy Fathers most diligently examining this cause of *Theodoret*, *nihil aliud ab eo exigisse noscuntur*, *are knowne to have required no more of him*, than that hee should anathematize *Nestorius*, and his impious doctrines; *hoc sibi tantummodo sufficere judicantes*; *judging this alone to be sufficient for them to receive* Theodoret. Now it is unfit, saith[c] he further, *nos aliquid quærere velut omissum à patribus*, *that we should seeke or require more than did the Councell of Chalcedon*; as if they had omitted any thing in this cause of *Theodoret*: seeing then they required no anathematizing of his writings against *Cyrill*, neither ought any others to anathematize, or require of any the anathematizing of the same.

d *Vig. Const. nu.* 180.

c *Ibid. nu.* 181.

12. As you saw *Vigilius* in the former Chapter to use *hæretica astutia*; so may any man here easily discerne, that hee useth an evident, and fallacious sophistication. The Councell indeed required not that, nor did *Theodoret* in explicite, or expresse termes performe it, saying, I anathematize my owne writings against *Cyrill*; but in implicite termes, in effect, and by an evident consequent, both the Councell required, and *Theodoret* performed this before them all; for, *hee subscribed*[f] *to the definition of faith decreed at Chalcedon*: one part of that definition is the approveing[g] of the Synodall Epistles of *Cyrill*: a part of one of those Epistles[h] are the twelve Chapters of *Cyrill*, which *Theodoret* refuted: in every one of those chapters, is an anathema denounced to the defenders of the contrarie doctrine: Then certainely, *Theodoret* by subscribing to the definition, subscribed to the Epistles of *Cyrill*, by them to the twelve chapters, and by doing so he condemned, and anathemized all who oppugned those twelve chapters, and then undoubtedly, his owne writings which were published, as a confutation of those twelve chapters. And it seemes strange, that *Vigilius* professing that *Theodoret* did *devotamente susciperc*, *with a devout affection receive* and approve the Epistles of *Cyrill*, and the doctrine of them, could deny or be ignorant, that in doing so he did anathematize his owne writings, which by the twelve chapters of *Cyrill*, are anathematized.

f *Ego autem et definitioni fidei subscripsi*, *ait Theod. in Conc. Chal. Act. 8.*

g *Approbamus Synodicas Epistolas Cyrilli. Conc. Chal. Act. 5. in definit.*

h *Nam continentur in Epist. Cyrilli et Conc. Alexand. ad Nestorium*, *quæ extat inter acta Concilij Ephes. to. 1. Act. 5. a. 14. et. repetitur in Conc. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 568. et seq.*

13. Besides this, how often, how plainely doth the Councell of *Chalcedon*[i] require, and urge *Theodoret* to anathematize *Nestorius* and his doctrines? how willingly did *Theodoret* performe this? What else is this, but a vertuall, and implicite anathematizing of those his owne writings against *Cyrill*, w^ch^ defended *Nestorius* and his doctrines? None can anathematize the former, but *eo ipso* he doth most certainely (though not expesly) anathematize the later; as on the contrary, none can say (as *Vigilius* doth, and decreeth, that all shall doe the like) none can say that the writings of *Theodoret* against *Cyrill*, and his twelve chapters,

i *Act. 8.*

ters ought not to be anathematized, but *eo ipso*, even by saying so, he doth most certainly (though but *implicitè* and by consequent) say that *Nestorius* and his heresie, ought not to be condemned. A truth so cleare that Pope *Pelagius* [k] from his anathematizing of *Nestorius* and his doctrine, concludeth of *Theodoret*: *Confat eundem*, it is manifest, that in doing this, he condemned his owne writings against the twelve Chapters of *Cyrill*.

[k] Pelag. 2. Epist. 7. §. Quo loc.

14. Neither is that true which *Vigilius* fancied, that to require men to anathematize the writings of *Theodoret*, is to seeke, and require more then the Councell of *Chalcedon* required: It is not. It is but requiring the selfe same thing to be done in actuall and expresse termes, which the Councel required and *Theodoret* performed in vertuall and implicite termes. The thing required and done is the same: the manner onely of doing it, or requiring it to be done, is different: Even as to require of men to professe Christ to be ὁμόουσιον, which the Councell of *Nice*, and the Church ever since requireth, is not to require them to professe more, or ought else, then the Scripture teacheth, and all catholikes [l] before professed, by those words, *I and my Father are one*: but it is a requiring of an explicite profession of that truth concerning the unity of substance of the Father, and the Sonne, which by those words of Scripture they did before *implicitè* professe.

[l] Hoc testimonio omnes patres utuntur contra Arianos, ut probent unum esse essentiam patris & filij. Bell. lib. 1. de Christ. ca. 6. §. Quartum.

15. But yet at least will some of *Vigilius* friends reply, it was unfit to require this explicite anathematizing of *Theodorets* writings, seeing the Councell of *Chalcedon* did not require it. No, not so neither. The explicite condemning of them, was not only fit, but necessarie at that time, in the dayes of *Iustinian*, and *Vigilius*; For as when the Arians denyed Christ to bee ὁμόουσιον, it was enough for one to cleare himselfe of Arianisme, to say, that he held this text for true, *I and the Father are one*, though therein he doe *implicitè* professe Christ to bee ὁμόουσιον, and though to have professed that alone, before the question about the unity of one substance was moved, had beene sufficient; but now he must *explicitè* professe that truth which is *explicitè* denyed and oppugned: even so it is in this cause of *Theodorets* writings, and all like it. While there was no doubt moved by heretikes, whether those writings of his ought to be condemned; and whether by the Councell of *Chalcedon* they were condemed or no, so long it was sufficient for one to professe that he condemned *Nestorius*, and subscribed to the definition of *Chalcedon*; both which were implicite condemning of those writings of *Theodoret*: but when the Nestorians began to boast, that *Theodorets* writings against *Cyrill*, neither were condemned, but rather with the author of them approved by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, neither ought to be condemned, the Church now was necessarily enforced to require of all men a profession of that truth in plaine and explicite termes, which before they made onely in generall and implicite. Nor could *Vigilius*, or any other Nestorian, who refused in expresse manner to condemne the writings of *Theodoret*, purge himselfe

ſelfe of that hereſie of *Neſtorius* at this time, by ſaying they approved the definition of *Chalcedon*, or condemned *Neſtorius*, though in both theſe they did *implicitè* condemne the writings of *Theodoret*, but now they muſt expreſly profeſſe that which the heretikes expreſly denyed, they muſt in plaine termes anathematize thoſe hereticall writings of *Theodoret*, and acknowledge them to have bin anathematized by the Councel of *Chalcedon*, as the heretiks in plaine termes vaũted, that neither they ought nor were anathematized, but approved by the Councel of *Chalcedon*, whenſoever any point tending to the impeaching of faith begins *explicitè* to be denyed, the holy Church may not then content her ſelfe in generall and *implicitè* to condemne the ſame, (few perhaps can perceive that, and many will make that generality of termes, as *Vigilius* and other Neſtorians now did, but a cloak for their hereſie) but the Church muſt now in moſt plaine, eaſie, and expreſſed manner that can be deviſed, both teach, declare, and define the ſame. This the Church did in this fift Councell, as in the other two, ſo in this Chapter touching *Theodorets* writings. It taught but the very ſame which the Councell of *Chalcedon* had done before it, anathematized thoſe his writings, which at *Chalcedon* were anathematized before, but they did this now in a plaine manner and *explicitè*, which by the Councell of *Chalcedon* only in an obſcure manner, and *implicitè* was done before.

16. The third perſonall errour which *Vigilius* [m] taketh for a ground of his decree, is that *Cyrill* himſelfe though he was ſo exceedingly injured by the writings of thoſe Eaſterne Biſhops that tooke part with *Neſtorius*, yet when he made union with them, he required them not to anathematize their owne writings, but overpaſt them in ſilence, as if there had never beene any ſuch: whence *Vigilius* inferreth, that neither ought this anathematizing of their writings (by name of *Theodorets*) bee required by others, yea he ſaith, the Fathers of *Chalcedon* imitated this example of *Cyrill*, and ſo would not require that of *Theodoret*, which they ſaw *Cyrill* not to have required of others.

17. The anſwer is eaſie by that which hath beene declared: this ſaying of *Vigilius* laboureth of the ſame equivocall ſophiſtication, as did the former; for both *Cyrill* required, and all who were united unto him, and received into his, which was the communion of the Catholike Church, they all did, though not in explicite termes, which then was not needfull, yet vertually, and after a certaine, and undoubted, though implicite manner, condemne, and anathematize all their writings againſt *Cyrill*, and the Catholike faith; for he received none till they had anathematized the doctrines of *Neſtorius*. This doth *Cyrill* himſelfe moſt plainly witneſſe in his Epiſtle to [n] *Dynatus*, *I would not*, ſaith he, *admit Paulus Biſhop of Emiſa into communion, priuſquam Neſtorij dogmata proprio chirographo anathematizaſſet, vntill hee had anathematized by his owne hand-writing the doctrines of Neſtorius*: And he intreated me in behalfe of the other Biſhops, that I would

m *Vig. Conſt. num. 181.*

n *Cyrill. Epiſt. ad Dynat. extat in Act. Conc. Epheſ. to. 3. fol. 16.*

reſt

reſt contented with that profeſſion which they had ſent, and require no more: *nulla ratione id fieri paſſus, I would by no meanes yeeld unto that*; but I ſent them a profeſſion of faith; and when *Iohn* 8. of *Antioch*, *cæterique, and the reſt with him*, had anathematized the doctrine of *Neſtorius*, then, and not before, *communionem illis reſtituimus, did we receive them into our communion*. Thus *Cyrill*, who by requiring this, did in effect require (& they performed the ſame) a condemning of all their witings which were made againſt him, and in defence of that hereſie of *Neſtorius*: And had *Cyrill* lived to ſee any queſtion made, whether thoſe writings (by whomſoever they had beene written) ought to bee, or were by himſelfe condemned; out of all doubt that holy Father would in moſt plaine, and expreſſe termes, have anathematized them all, as vertually, and *implicitè* he had before, and would moſt ſtrictly have exacted the like expreſſe anathematizing of them, of all thoſe who would waſh their hands of the blaſphemies, and hereſies of *Neſtorius*.

18. Now from theſe three grounds (every one of which is demonſtrated to be untrue) *Vigilius* collects his Concluſion; or definitive ſentence in defence of this *ſecond Chapter*, which alſo is an errour, but not as the former, perſonall, but doctrinall; yea, hereticall: that thoſe writings of *Theodoret*, or going under *Theodorets* name againſt *Cyrill*, and his twelve Chapters, ought not to be condemned; which is as much as if he had decreed plainly, that the hereſies of *Neſtorius* ought not to be condemned; for in thoſe writings of *Theodoret*, they are all defended, and that with ſuch eagerneſſe, art, and acuteneſſe, that if all other Neſtorian books were aboliſhed, thoſe writings alone of *Theodoret* would ſuffice as a rich ſtorehouſe to furniſh the Neſtorians with abundance of all kinde of weapons, to maintaine their owne, and oppugne the Catholike cauſe; nor ever can Neſtorianiſme bee puld downe, or overthrowne, ſo long as thoſe writings of *Theodoret* keepe their credit, and ſtand uncondemned, yet ſhal not theſe be condemned, doth *Vigilius* decree.

19. Pope *Pelagius* ſeeing the poiſon of the hereticall doctrine, which the defending of this *ſecond Chapter* doth beare with it, exclaimes againſt it in this manner [o]: *O my deare brethren, who ſeeth not theſe things to bee full of all impiety?* And againe, who ſeeth not *quanta temeritate plenum ſit Theodoreti ſcripta ſuperbiendo defendere? how full of temeritie it is to defend ſo inſolently, the writings of Theodoret? The fift generall Councell* [p], *not onely accurſeth thoſe writings of Theodoret, as hereticall, but all who defend them, yea all who doe not anathematize them.* A cleare evidence that they not onely judged this *ſecond Chapter* to concerne the faith, but the *Conſtitution* of *Vigilius* even herein to be hereticall, becauſe he would not anathematize thoſe writings of *Theodoret*, and much more becauſe he decreed that they ſhould not be anathematized, and to their judgement conſenteth the whole ca-

[o] Pelag. 2. Epiſt. 7. §. Quis hæc.

[p] Collat. 8. pa. 587.

tholike Church, they all condemne the decree of *Vigilius* even in this point as hereticall.

q *Quæcunq; scripta vel dogmata sceleratorum Neſtorij & Eutychetis erroribus manifeſtantur conſonare, anathematizamus & damnamus. Vig. Conſt. nu. 182.*

20. I, but *Vigilius* you will ſay condemneth [q] thoſe very hereſies of *Neſtorius*, which are defended in thoſe writings; he doth ſo: at leaſt he ſeemes by his words to doe it: and had he not withall decreed that *Theodorets* writings ſhould not bee condemned, he could not juſtly have beene reproved in this point. But in doing both, he proves not himſelfe orthodoxal, by that w^ch he ſaith well, but unconſtant and contrary to himſelfe in overthrowing that which he ſaith well, for if *Theodorets* writings againſt *Cyrill* may not be condemned, as *Vigilius* decreth; then may not the doctrines of *Neſtorius* defended therein be condemned as *Vigilius* would ſeeme to doe. *Theodorets* writings and Neſtorianiſme are inſeparable companions, either both muſt ſtand, or both fall together. Its as impoſſible, and repugnant to condemne the one, and deny that the other may be condemned, as to condemne Euticheaniſme, and yet defend the Epheſine latrocinie and decree thereof, or condemne Arianiſme, and not condemne the *Arimine* Councel. Its the honor of truth, that it never is nor can be diſſonant to any other truth: but hereſie not onely may, but almoſt ever doth fight, not only againſt truth, but againſt it ſelfe, & overthroweth with one hand, or poſitiõ, what it builds up by another, as in this of *Vigilius* is now apparent.

21. Now although this clearly convinceth the Popes decree to be hereticall, ſeeing it maintaineth two contradictory poſitions in a cauſe of faith, & the one is without all doubt an hereſie; yet is it worthy the examining, whether of theſe contradictories muſt paſſe for the Popes judgment & *cathedrall* reſolution in this cauſe. Cardinall *Baronius* will certainly direct vs in this doubt: for he tells us (which of it ſelfe alſo is evident) that the Popes purpoſe [r] & intent in ſetting forth this *Conſtitution*, was to defẽd the 3 *Chapters: adverſus Imperatoris decretum, & ſententiam Synodi, againſt the Emperors Edict, and the ſentence of the fift Synode.* As the Emperour then and the Synode condemned, ſo was it the Popes maine purpoſe to defend the writings of *Theodoret* againſt *Cyrill*, which was the *ſecond Chapter*. This is & muſt ſtand for the judgement & cathedrall reſolution of the Pope in this matter: what he ſpeaks repugnant to this is caſuall, & *præter*, nay *contra intentionem, its againſt his mind & purpoſe*; its to be thought onely by inincogitancy to have ſlipt from his pen. So his condemning of the Neſtorian doctrine is but in ſhew, its onely verball, his defining that *Theodorets* writings which maintaine Neſtorianiſme may not be condemned, is the true purpoſe and intent of his mind, its cordial & real. By his verball condemning of Neſtorianiſme, he ſhuts it out in words, or as you may ſay at the foregate of his pallace, By his defining that *Theodorets* writings may not be condemned, he puls in Neſtorianiſme with all his might, & ſets wide open a poſtren gate unto it: by condemning Neſtorianiſme in ſhew

r *Pro ipſorum defenſione laborat Vigilius. Bar. an. 553. nu. 172.*
ſ *Ibid. nu. 222.*

ſhew of words, he ſeemes to be orthodoxall, by defending Neſtorianiſme indeed and in truth, he demonſtrates himſelfe to be hereticall. Or becauſe *Vigilius* was ſo very wiſe a Pope as hereafter out of *Baronius* you ſhall heare; it ſeemes he meant to ſhew one part of his wiſedome, and policie, in this matter, and therefore while the hereſie of *Neſtorius* comes in his owne naturall habit, or in the liverie of *Neſtorius*, away with it, the Popes holineſſe will not admit it, hee cannot abide it; but when it comes countenanced, and graced, with the name of *Theodoret*, and in his liverie, the Pope embraceth it in both his armes, and by his *Apoſtolicall* authoritie commandeth all men, to give moſt friendly welcome and entertainement unto it.

22 You have now the judgement, and cathedrall reſolution of *Vigilius*, touching this *ſecond Chapter*, that the hereticall writings of *Theodoret* againſt *Cyril*, and the Catholike faith may not bee condemned. Take a view alſo of thoſe two reaſons, by which hee labours to ſtrengthen, and perſwade the ſame. The former is drawne from the Councell at *Chalcedon*: It is, ſaith *Vigilius*, [t] *valde contrarium, & Chalcedonenſis Synodi judicio indubitabiliter inimicum, very contrarie, and without all doubt repugnant to the judgement of the Synod at Chalcedon*, that any Nettorian doctrines ſhould now be condemned, *ſub ejus ſacerdotis nomine, under the name of Biſhop Theodoret*. So *Vigilius*. [t] *Vig. conſt. ad.* 180.

23 Could he not content himſelfe, to be hereticall alone, unleſſe he diſgraced the holy Councell of *Chalcedon* as guilty of the ſame hereſie, as if they alſo had judged that none of *Theodorets* writings, not thoſe written againſt the faith, ought to bee condemned? They to judge this? or is it contrary, and that *indubitabiliter*; to condemne thoſe writings of *Theodoret*, or any writings under his name? Far was it from the thought, much more from the grave judgement of ſo holy a Councell. Even themſelves, as before we declared, condemned and anathematized all thoſe writings of *Theodorrt*, and warranted by their judgement all others to anathematize the ſame. *Gregorie* witneſſeth of the fift Councell, that it is *ſequax in omnibus*, [u] *in all things a follower of the Councell at Chalcedon*. Seeing then the fift Councell, doth ſo often and ſo conſtantly condemne and anathematize thoſe writings of *Theodoret*, its undoubted, that the ſame writings were formerly condemned by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, the fift Synod but treading in their ſteps and following them in that judgement, wherein they had gone before them. If to condemne thoſe writings be repugnant to the judgment at *Chalcedon*, then is the fift Councell not a follower but a confuter and contradicter of the judgement at *Chalcedon*. Nor onely the fift Councell, but the whole catholike Church ever ſince the time of *Vigilius*, they all doe reject, and condemne the judgement of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, ſeeing they all by approving the fift Synod, and decree thereof, do anathematize

[u] *Lib. 7. Indic. 2. Epiſt. 54.*

thoſe writings of *Theodoret*, which to doe is, as *Vigilius* teacheth, *indubitanter contrarium*, *moſt certainely contrary to the judgement at Chalcedon*. If the whole catholike Church bee not hereticall (which to thinke is impietie) by contradicting and condemning the judgement of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, then undoubtedly is *Vigilius* hereticall in teaching and decreeing, that to condemne any writings of *Theodoret*, or any under his name, is repugnant to the judgement of the Councell at *Chalcedon*.

24. The other reaſon of *Vigilius*, is, becauſe it were a diſgrace, injury and ſlander, againſt *Theodoret*, to condemne his writings. This the Pope[x] expreſſeth in the very words of his ſentence, in this manner; *The truth of theſe things*, (thoſe are the three perſonall points before handled) *being weighed, we ordaine and decree, nihil in injuriam, atque obtrectationem probatiſſimi viri, hoc eſt Theodoreti ſub taxatione nominis ejus, à quoquam fieri vel proferri, that nothing ſhall be done or ſpoken by any, to the injury and ſlader of the moſt approved Biſhop Theodoret by taxing of his name*: and it muſt needs be taxed, if his writings or bookes be condemned.

[x] *Vigil. Conſt. nu.* 182.

25. See here the compaſſionate and tender heart of *Vigilius*. Not onely *Iuſtinian*, and the fift generall Councell, but *Pelagius*, *Gregory*, and other ſucceeding Popes, and Councels, even the whole Catholike Church ever ſince the time of *Vigilius*, they all, by approving the decree of the fift Synod, doe not onely taxe the name of *Theodoret*, but accurſe, & anathematize the writings of *Theodoret*, and that even under his name: Now, ſuch a loving and tender affection doth the Pope carry towards the hereticall writings of *Theodoret*, that rather than they may be condemned, or his name taxed by the condemning of them; *Iuſtinian*, *Pelagius*, *Gregory*, and other his ſucceſſors, the fift, the ſixt, and other generall Councels, even the whole Catholike Church, they all muſt be, and are *de facto*, here declared, and by the Popes *cathedrall* ſentence decreed, and defined, not onely to bee hereticall, (as the former reaſon imported) but injurious perſons, backbiters, & ſlanderers, they all muſt be condemned, and for ever diſgraced, rather then *Theodorets* name muſt bee taxed, or his hereticall writings condemned, or diſgraced.

26. But ſay indeed: Is it an injurie, a ſlander, a diſgrace to one, that his errors ſhould either by himſelfe, or by the Church be condemned? How injurious was that holy Biſhop Saint *Auguſtine* to himſelfe in writing ſo many retractations, and corrections of what he ſaw amiſſe? And what himſelfe did, hee would not onely willingly, but gladly have permitted the holy Church to have done. Nor may we think this mind to have been onely in *Auſten*, Modeſtie and humilitie, are the individuall concomitants of true knowledge and learning: and the more learned any man is, the more judicious is he in eſpying, the more ingenuous in acknowledging, the more lowly and humble, in condemning his owne errors. As it is but winde and no ſolid

ſubſtance,

substance, which puffes up a bladder, so is it never any sound, or solid learning, but meere ventositie & emptinesse of knowledge which makes the minde to swell, to beare it selfe aloft, and either not see that truth into which his high and windie conceit will not suffer him to looke downe and dive, or seeing it, not embrace the same, though it were with a condemning, yea with a detestation of his owne error. It must never be a shame or disgrace to any man to recall and condemne his errors, till he be ashamed of being a man, that is subject to errors. Saint *Augustine* y more sharply saith, *That its a token not onely of a foolish, and proud selfe-love, but of a most malignant* z *minde, rather to wish others to bee poysoned with his heresies, then either himselfe to recall, or permit others, specially the Church of God, to condemne his heresies.* It was no injurie, no slander, nor disgrace to *Theodoret*, that his heretical writings, were by the Church condemned, but it had beene a fault unexcusable and an eternall disgrace to the Church, if shee had suffered such heretical writings to passe uncondemned.

y *Illi quos vulgò morones vocant, quanto magis absurdi & insulsi sunt, tanto magis nullum verbum emittunt quod reuocare velint, quia dicti mali pœnitere, atque corrigere eos. Aug. Epist. 7.*

z *Nimis perverse se infamat, qui de aliis vult errare ut error sum lateat. ibid.*

27. Oh but *Theodoret* was, *probatissimus vir*, *a man most approved* by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, saith *Vigilius*, is it not an injury to condemne the writings of a man most approved? No verely, the more approved, the more eminent, learned, and orthodoxall any man is, the more carefull and ready, both himselfe, and the Church must be to condemne his former heretical writings: When heresie commeth in his owne deformed habit, it doth but little, or no hurt at all; who will not detest it, when he reades it in the writings of *Arius*, *Nestorius*, *Eutiches*, or such like condemned heretikes? the odiousnesse of their names breeds a dislike almost of a truth in their mouthes, but certainly of an errour; But when Satan assumes the forme of an Angell of light, when heresie comes palliated, yea, countenanced with the name of a Catholike, a learned, an holy, a renowned and approved Bishop, then, and then specially is there danger of infection: The reverence, the love, the honour wee beare to such a person, causeth us unawares to swallow the poyson which hee reacheth unto us, before we take leasure to examine, or once make doubt of his doctrine.

28. It was truely said by a *Vincentius Lirinensis*, The errour of the Master, is the tryall of the Scholler, *& tanto major sensatio, quanto ipse doctior, qui erraret, and the more learned the teacher is, the greater still is the temptation*, which, beside other, he shewes by the example of *Origen*, he was in his age a mirrour b of gravity, integrity, continency, zeale c, piety, of learning of all sorts, both divine, and humane, of so d happy a memory, that he had the Bible without booke, of such admirable eloquence, that not words but hony e seemed to drop from his lips, of so indefatigable industry, that he was called *Adamantius*, and was said by some f to have written six thousand bookes, by g *Hierome*, one thousand, besides innumerable commentaries; of such high esteeme

a *Vin. de Hæres. ca. 23.*

b *Vincent. Lir. loc. citato.*

c *Zelo dei se truncavit. Hier. Epist. ad Pamac. & Oceanum. to. 2. pa. 194.*

d *Scripturas memoriter tenebat. ibid.*

e *Vinc. loc. cit.*

f *Hier. lib. 2. adv. Russin.*

g *Hier. epist. ad Pam.*

esteeme, and authority, that Christians [h] honoured him as a Prophet, Philosophers, as a Master; they flocked from the utmost parts of the world to heare his wisedome, as if a second *Salomon* had beene sent from heaven; yea, most would say, *malle se cum Origene errare, quam cum aliis vera sentire, that they had rather erre with Origen, then thinke aright with others.* When such a man lapseth into heresie, if his writings may scape without censure, if it shall be judged a contumelie, an injurie or slander, to condemne his bookes, for the honour which was given to his person, one such man as *Origen*, were able to draw almost the third part of the starres of heaven after him.

h Vinc. loc cit.

29. And if any beleeve the Epistles going under his name, *Theodoret* was in divers respects, not much inferiour to *Origen. His birth noble,* [i] *his parents being without hope of Children, vowed* [k] *him before his conception, like another Samuel unto God.* And accordingly even from his Cradle consecrated him to Gods service: *Violently* [l] *drawne to the dignity of a Bishop, the Citie of Cyrus in Syria, where was his episcopall See,* he nobilitated, being before but obscure (though worthy [m] of eternall memorie, as being one monument of the deliverance of Gods people, by the hand of *Cyrus*, out of the Babylonish captivitie) So upright, blamelesse, and voide of covetousnesse, that having beene five and twenty yeares Bishop of that place, in all that time, *ne* [n] *obolum mihi in tribunali ablatum aliquis conqueſtus est, none could say that hee had exacted, or received for causes of judgement, so much as one halfe pennie.* I tooke no mans goods, no mans garments, nay, which is a memorable token of integritie, none of mine house, saith he, hath taken the worth of an egge, or a morsell of bread: So plentifull in workes of charitie, *That he distributed* [o] *his inheritance among the poore, repaired Churches,* [p] *builded bridges, drained Rivers, to townes where was want of water,* and such like, in so much, saith he, that in all this time, I have [q] provided nothing for my selfe, not any land, not any house, no not so much as any sepulcher, nothing, *praeter laceras has vestes,* I have left nothing to my selfe, but onely this ragged attire, wherewith I am apparelled, For learning and knowledge both in divine and humane matters he was much honoured, compared to *Nilus* [r] as watering the whole countrie, where hee abode with the streames of his knowledge, he converted eight townes, [s] infected with the heresie of the *Martionites*, to the faith, two other of the *Arians* and *Eunomians*: wherein he tooke such paines, and that also with some expence of his blood, and hazard of his life, that in eight hundreth parishes (within the Dioceſse of *Cyrus*) *Ne* [t] *unum quidem haereticorum vestigium remansit, there remained not so much as one hereticall weed.*

i Nobilibus parentibus nascitur. Posse. in Theodor.
k Epist. Theod. 81. ad Nonnum extat apud Bar. an. 448. nu. 12.
l Invitus episcopus jam ordinatus ibid.
m Erat in Syria oppidulum vehementer regelatum Cyrus nomine, a Iudaeis extructum ut qualemcunque gratiam benefactori (Cyro) referret. Proc. de aedific. Iustin. Orat. 2. in fine.
n Theod. Epist. ad Nonium.
o Quae nobis a parentibus obvenerùt, post eorum mortem statim distribui. Theod. Epist ad Leonem. extat inter Epistolas Leonis post Ep. 62.
p Theod. Epist. 81.
q Epist. Theod. ad Leonem. & ad Nonium.
r ὡς νεῖλος ἄλλος Epig. apud Poss. in Theodor.
s Theod. Epist. ad Nonium quae est 81.
t Ibid.

30. So learned, so laborious, so worthy a Bishop was *Theodoret*: and so desirous am I not to impaire any part of his honour, much lesse to injure, disgrace, or slander him. Whom almost would

would not the writings of a man ſo noble for birth, and parentage, ſo famous for learning, ſo eminent in vertue, move and perſwade to aſſent unto him, if they might goe currant without taxing, without note or cenſure of the Church? and that much more than the bookes of *Origen*; both becauſe *Origen* was but a *Prebyter*, but *Theodoret* a Biſhop, and ſpecially becauſe *Origen*[u] himſelfe was by the Church condemned; and ſo the author being diſgraced, the authority of his writings muſt needs be very ſmall: but the perſon of *Theodoret* was approved by the whole Councell of *Chalcedon, they all proclamed*[x] *him to bee a Catholike, and orthodoxall Biſhop*. Here was a farre greater temptation, and greater danger when his writings are hereticall, whoſe perſon, ſo famous and holy a Councell commendeth for Catholike. Now, or never was the Church to ſhew that it honoured no mans perſon, writings, or name, more thā the truth of Chriſt. And ſo much the rather was the Church to doe this in *Theodoret*, becauſe about ſome thirty[y] yeares, before this fift Councell, in the time of *Iuſtinus* the Emperour, the Neſtorians (as if not onely ſome writings of his, but *Theodoret* himſelfe had beene wholly theirs) *ſet up*[z] *his image in a Chariot, and with great pompe, and ſinging of hymines, brought it in triumphant manner into the City of Cyrus*, where *Sergius* a Neſtorian, and Biſhop of that place, mentioned in a Collect *Theodorus* of Mopſveſtia, *Neſtorius*, and *Theodoret* as three of their principall Neſtorian Saints: was it not now high time to wipe away that blemiſh from the name of *Theodoret*, and to condemne thoſe writings of his which gave occaſion to the Neſtorians to make ſuch boaſts?

31. I appeale now unto any man, whether their condemning of *Theodorets* writings, did not much more tend to the honour, then, as *Vigilius* fancieth, to the ſlander, and diſgrace of his perſon. As it is a blemiſh to a man to retaine a filthy ſpot in his garment, but the taking of it away doth grace, and make him more comely; even ſo the name of *Theodoret* was ſtained by thoſe writings; they emboldened the Neſtorians to put him in their curſed Calender; but by the condemning of thoſe writings was the ſtaine and blemiſh wiped away from his perſon, his name, and honour was vindicated from the Neſtorians, and brought, as it well deſerved, to the holy Church of GOD; nothing of *Theodoret* left for heretikes to vaunt of, but the onely ſtaines of *Theodoret*; nothing but thoſe hereticall writings condemned and accurſed, both by *Theodoret* himſelfe, and by the whole Church of God.

32. No, no; it is Pope *Vigilius* (and ſuch as applaud his decree for infallible) that diſgraceth, and moſt ignominiouſly uſeth the name, perſon, and memory of *Theodoret*: By his decree thoſe heretical writings of *Theodoret*, which, by the Churches ſentence of condemnation are quite dulled, receive full ſtrength, and vigour for the Neſtorians againſt Catholikes: By him the Neſtorians have

u *Originem, fontem Ary, Nicani patres percuſſere, damnantes enim eos qui filium negant eſſe de ſubſtantia patris, illum (Origi. ē) Ariumque d. mnaverunt. Hier. Epiſt. ad Pammac. de error. Orig. Omnis tam orientis, quam occi. d. ntis Catholicorum Synodus, illum, hereticum denunciat. Hier. Apol. 2. adver. Ruff.*

x *Con. Chal. Act. 8.*

y *Num Iuſtini reſcriptum de eā re datum eſt Ruſtico coſſ. ut liquet ex Conc. 5. Coll. 7. pa. 582. Vbi reſcriptum extat. Ruſticus vero Conſul cum Vitaliano an. 520. Marcel. in Chron. et Bar. in eum annum nu. 1. 2 Conc. 5. Coll. 7. pa. 582. et pa. 578. a.*

have an eternall charter, and irrevocable decree, that *Theodorets* writings againſt *Cyrill*, and with them the hereſie of *Neſtorius*, ought not to be taxed, nor condemned. His *Apoſtolicall* Conſtitution is a triumphant chariot for them to ſet the Image of *Theodoret* in their Temples, and with Anthemes and Colleƈts to canonize, yea adore him in their Maſſes, among their hereticall Saints. But for the Church of God, I conſtantly affirme they could not poſſibly have more honoured *Theodoret*, than by burning up the hay and ſtubble of his writings, the condemning of which the Pope decreeth to bee an injury and ſlander unto him.

33. May wee now in the laſt place conſider a little what might be the intendment of *Vigilius* in pleading, and decreeing this for *Theodorets* writings? I doubt not but the love he bare to Neſtorianiſme might make him zealous for thoſe writings, which are the bulwarks of the Neſtorians: but *non ſunt in eo omnia*. Popes are men of profound thoughts, and very long reaches; they have deepe, and myſticall projeƈts in their decrees. *Vigilius* had, and it may be principally, an eye to this his owne, and all their *Cathedrall* Conſtitutions like unto it: If the hereticall writings of *Theodoret* may not be condemned, becauſe himſelfe was a Catholike, *à fortiori*, this decree of *Vigilius*, be it never ſo hereticall, may not bee condemned, becauſe the Pope is the head of all Catholikes. If it bee an injury, and a ſlandering of *Theodoret*, to taxe him, or his name, by condemning his writings; it muſt much more be an injury, and ſlander, nay, that is nothing, even a blaſphemy and ſinne irremiſſible to taxe the Popes Holineſſe, by condemning his *Apoſtolicall* decree: If you preſume to condemne, nay, but taxe them, or their names, though their decrees ſhall bee as apparently hereticall, as are thoſe writings of *Theodoret*, you are condemned for ever as injurious, as contumelious, as ſlandering perſons. And let this ſuffice for the errours both perſonall, and doƈtrinall, of *Vigilius* touching this *ſecond Chapter*.

CAP.

CAP. X.

That Vigilius *and* Baronius *erre in divers personall points, & matters of fact, concerning the* third Chapter, *or the* Epistle *of* Ibas.

HEre remaineth now the *third* & last *Chapter*, wch concernes the impious *Epistle* of *Ibas*, In handling whereof, being of them all most intricate and obscure, as *Vigilius* first, and then long after him his Champion *Baronius*, have here bestowed greatest paines, and used all their subtilty, judging this to bee (as indeed by reason of the manifold obscurities, it is) the fittest cloake for their heresie; so must I on the other side intreate the more serious and attentive consideration at the readers hands, while I indeavour, not onely to discover the darke and secret corners of this cause, but pull both the Pope and his Parasite out of this, being their strongest hold, and most hidden heretickall den, wherein they hoped of all other most safely and securely to have lurked; for the more perspicuous proceeding wherein, before I come to the doctrinall errours, and maine heresie which in this *third Chapter* they maintaine; I will first manifest two or three of their personall untruths, which will both open a passage to the other, and will give the reader a taste, nay, a certaine experiment what truth, fidelity, and faire-dealing he is to expect at the hands of *Vigilius* and *Baronius* in their handling of this Chapter.

2. The first, and that indeed a capitall untruth, is, that *Vigilius* avoucheth the Councell of *Chalcedon* to have approved this *Epistle* of *Ibas* as orthodoxall. They approve that impious, and blasphemous Epistle? they rejected, they condemned, anathematized, and accursed it to the very pit of hell, witnesse the fift generall Councell, and the whole Catholike Church, which hath approved it; for this cryed out, and proclaimed all the Bishops, *Epistolam* [b] *definitio sancti Chalcedonensis Concilij vendemnavit, ejecit; the definition of faith made by the holy Councell at Chalcedon hath condemned this Epistle, it hath cast out this Epistle.* But because I have formerly [c] intreated hereof, I will adde no more of this which is proclaimed by the whole Church to be an untruth.

3. The second untruth is like this. *Vigilius* having cited the interloquutions of *Paschasinus*, and *Maximus*, wherein they say that *Ibas* by his *Epistle* is declared to bee a Catholike, [d] addeth, that all the rest in the Councell of *Chalcedon* did not onely not contradict their interloquutions, *verumetiam apertissimum eis nescuntur præbuisse consensum; but also they are knowne to have assented, and*

a *Orthodoxæ fidei à patribus pronunciata definitio. Vig. Const. nu. 192.*

b *Concil. t. col. 6. pa. 576. b.*

c *Supra ca. 4. s. 1. 3. 13.*

d *Vig. Const. nu. 190*

and that moſt manifeſtly unto thoſe interloquutions. So *Vigilius.* It had beene enough, and too much to have ſaid, that the Councell had aſſented, or had but ſeemed to aſſent: but *Vigilius* in ſaying that all the reſt did moſt manifeſtly aſſent to thoſe interloquutions, uttered a papall and ſupreme untruth, whereof no colourable pretence can be made, witneſſe the fift generall Councell, and the whole Catholike Church, which hath approved it: They expreſſly [e] teſtifie, that the Councell of *Chalcedon* did *pro nullo habere, eſteeme as nothing*, that which was ſpoken by one or two, (thoſe were *Paſcaſinus*, and *Maximus*) for that *Epiſtle*, but of this alſo I have ſpoken before.

e *Conc. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 576. a. b.*

4. Now both theſe vntruths, whereof *Vigilius* is ſo evidently, and by ſo ample witneſſes convicted, Cardinall *Baronius* hath againe revived, telling with a face more hard than Braſſe, or Adamant, *Patres* [f] *dixerunt eam Epiſtolam ut Catholicam recipiendam; the Fathers of Chalcedon ſaid, that this Epiſtle of Ibas is to be received as orthodoxall:* and [g] againe, *ex ipſa Ibam fuiſſe probatum orthodoxum, aquè una fuit ſententia omnium Epiſcoporum; that Ibas was by this Epiſtle approved for a Catholike, it was the conſent and uniforme judgement of all the Biſhops at Chalcedon;* then which, two lowder untruths, and well worthy of a golden whetſtone, could hardly have beene uttered: And though he tooke them from Pope *Vigilius*, yet are they farre more inexcuſable in the Cardinall, than in the Pope his Maſter. *Vigilius* dyed before he ſaw the judgement of ſucceeding Popes, and generall Councels; which had he knowne, wee may charitably thinke, that his Holineſſe would have caſſeired and defaced ſuch palpable, and condemned untruths: But Cardinall *Baronius* knew all this; hee knew that the fift [h] generall Councell had condemned theſe untruths in *Vigilius*: he knew that *Pelagius*, [i] *Gregory*, and their ſucceſſors, that the ſixt, [k] ſeventh, and other generall Councels had approved the fift Councell, and ſo in approving it, had condemned thoſe ſame untruths; and yet againſt the knowne conſent, and judgement of all thoſe Popes, and generall Councels, that is, againſt the knowne teſtimonie of the whole Catholike Church for a thouſand yeares together, he is bold to avouch both thoſe former ſayings, for truths, which all thoſe former witneſſes with one voyce proclaime, to be condemned untruths. Such account doth the Cardinall make of Fathers, Popes, Generall Councels, and of the whole Catholike Church, when they come croſſe in his way.

f *Bar. an. 553. nu. 191.*

g *Ba an. 448. nu. 71*

h *In 6. collatione Conc. 5. allata ab ipſo Vigilio pro defenſione Iba Epiſtole confutantur. Bar. an. 553. nu. 210.*

i *Gregorius cum prædeceſſoribus & ſucceſſoribus ejus omnes quintam Synodum confirmaſſe, noſcuntur. Bar. an. 553. nu. 229.*

k *Bar. ibid.*

5. A third perſonall matter there is concerning this Chapter, of which not *Vigilius*, but Cardinall *Baronius* doth enforce me to intreate; and that is, whether *Ibas* was indeed the author of this *Epiſtle*, or no: for although it be not materiall to the intent of the fift Councell, (which, againſt the decree of *Vigilius*, we now defend) whether *Ibas* writ it or not, ſeeing neither this fift, nor the former Councell of *Chalcedon* condemned the author of this Epiſtle, but onely the Epiſtle it ſelfe; yet ſeeing the Cardinall

Cardinall was pleaſed to undertake the defence of a needleſſe untruth, that this is not the Epiſtle of *Ibas*. I am deſirous that all ſhould ſee how wiſely and worthily hee hath behaved himſelfe in this point.

6. *Baronius* ſpeaking againſt this *Epiſtle*, firſt makes it doubtfull whoſe it is, ſaying [l], *author qui fertur nomine Iba, quiſquis ille fuerit, the author of this Epiſtle which paſſeth under the name of Ibas, whatſoever he be*; and having thus bred a diſtruſt in your mindes: then as the ſerpent dealt with *Eve*, hee poſitively ſets downe his untruth. It is not the *Epiſtle* of *Ibas*, in this manner: *Cæterum*, [m] *ut publica acta teſtantur, producta in Concilium Epiſtola illa, non eſſe Iba comperta, but the publike acts doe teſtifie, that when this Epiſtle was produced in the Councell at Chalcedon, it was found not to be the Epiſtle of Ibas*: and ſo it being condemned, *Ibas* was abſolved. Thus *Baronius*, who for proofe hereof alleageth the publike acts [n] both of the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and of the 2. Nicene Synod. And truly in the ſecond *Nicene* Synod, that which the Cardinall ſaith, is read indeed by *Epiphanius*, a Deacon in that Synod: but it is the teſtimony of the whole Councell, *Epiphanius* onely reading and propoſing it in the name [o] and behalfe of the Synod. And becauſe it is a teſtimony very pregnant for the Cardinalls aſſertion, and is cited out of a Councel which he much honoreth, & affecteth, I will do him the favour, as at large to expreſſe that paſſage: the rather becauſe this, as the whole anſwer read by *Epiphanius*, is not onely commended as a matter delivered [p] unto them by the holy Ghoſt: *but they further requeſt* [q] *all who ſhall happen to light on that commentarie of theirs, that they will not read it ſlightly, or perfunctorily, but with ſingular indagation and ſearch of the ſame*. And I am loth to deny thoſe Nicene Fathers, ſo very juſt and reaſonable a requeſt.

7. In that place [r] there was read on the behalfe of the Iconoclaſts, a teſtimonie out of the ancient Father *Epiphanius* Biſhop of *Cyprus*, forbidding to ſet up Images either in the Churches, or [s] in Churchyards, or in their common dwelling houſes, but every where to carie about, God in their hearts. This ſaying netled the Nicene Fathers not a little, who were very ſuperſtitiouſly devoted to Image-worſhip: and therefore inſtead of a better anſwer, they ſay that the booke whence that is alleaged, is falſly [t] aſcribed to *Epiphanius*, hee was not the author of it. *Epiphanius they honor* [u] *as an holy Father and Doctor of the Catholike Church, but that booke going under his name, they reject*: which fact of theirs, they illuſtrate and labour to warrant by the example of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, who received *Ibas* himſelfe, but accurſed the *Epiſtle* going under the name of *Ibas*, *non* [x] *enim demonſtrari poterat quod eſſet Iba: for it could not be proved to be the Epiſtle of Ibas*: wherefore they anathematized not *Ibas*, but it: *Dicebatur enim Iba, cum tamen illius haudquaquam eſſet: for it was ſaid to be the Epiſtle of Ibas, whereas indeed it was none of his*. Even ſo

l Bar. an. 432. nu. 71.

m Ibid.

n Conc. Chalc. Act. 10. & Conc. Nic. 2. Act. 6. citantur à Bar. ibidem.

o Epiphanius ſcitam à patribus appoſitam reſponſionem perlegit. Bar. nu. 787. nu. 34.

p Quam confutationem nobis ſpiritus ſanctus dedit. Conc. Nic. 2. Act. 6. pa. 356. a.

q Rogamus autem, quicunq; etc. ibid b.

r Conc. Nic 2. Act. 6. pa. 371. a.

s Epiphanius Cyprius ſic inquit, Ne in eccleſiam imagines inferatis, neque in cæmiteriis ſtatuatis: neque in domo communi toleventur. ibid.

t Id (ex Epiphanio lectum) nequaquam illius exiſtit. ibid. a. Et, verum ut novity (libelli) et alieni falſiq; ſunt. ibid b.

u Commentarium illum reÿcimus beatum autem patrem (Epiph.) eccleſiæ Doctorem agnoſcimus. ibid. b.

x Ibid. b.

ſo thoſe falſe writings againſt venerable Images are ſaid to bee the writings of Biſhop *Epiphanius*, but they are not his. So thoſe publike acts, and ſecond Nicene Fathers, whoſe teſtimony concurreth and jumpeth with the Cardinall, this is not the Epiſtle of *Ibas*.

8. Before I come to examine thoſe publike acts, I muſt obſerve one thing touching *Baronius*, which he will occaſion and inforce me often to repeat; and this it is, that *Baronius* was meerly infatuated in his handling of this whole cauſe touching the *three Chapters*, and this one might almoſt even ſweare: but any may ſee it as cleare as the light: beſides many other, even by this one point whereof we now intreat. If a man ſhould ſtudy and deviſe ten dayes together, how to confute and utterly overthrow all that Pope *Vigilius* hath decreed touching this *third Chapter*; and all which *Baronius* himſelfe hath either taught or ſaid in defence of *Vigilius* in that point, he cannot poſſibly doe it more clearly, more certainly, more effectually, then by denying, as the Cardinall, and his Nicene Fathers doe, that this is the Epiſtle of *Ibas*: for how could either the Councell of *Chalcedon*, or the Popes Legates therein, by this Epiſtle, and by the dictation and contents thereof judge *Ibas* to be a Catholike (which *Vigilius* [y] decreeth, and *Baronius* [z] more then twenty times I thinke repeateth,) unleſſe it were indeed the Epiſtle of *Ibas*; for of *Ibas* no otherwiſe then in the firſt perſon, or as the author and writer of it, there is no mention at all to be found or collected out of that Epiſtle.

y *Vigil. Conſt. nu.* 196.
z *Bar. an.* 553. *nu.* 191, 192, 193, 196 197, *&c.*

9. Now if you require teſtimonies, or authorities in this caſe, I oppoſe to *Baronius* the Popes Legates at *Chalcedon*, of which *Baronius* himſelfe ſaith [a]; *This to be the Epiſtle of Ibas, the Popes Legates, and after them the reſt of the Biſhops by their ſubſcription, confirmed*, and againe, the [b] Acts of *Chalcedon* doe teach, that this we acknowledged to be the Epiſtle of *Ibas*. I oppoſe Pope *Vigilius*, who in his *Conſtitution* aſſenteth [c] to that judgement of the Popes Legates, and thoſe words, *relecta ejus Epiſtola, the Epiſtle of Ibas being read*, we acknowledge him to be a Catholike. I oppoſe the confeſſion of *Ibas* himſelfe, of which *Baronius* ſaith, the [d] Acts at *Chalcedon* declare *Ibam confeſſum eſſe eam eſſe ſuam, that Ibas confeſſed this Epiſtle to be his owne*: and againe [e], we have before declared *Ibam eandem Epiſtolam ſuam eſſe profeſſum, that Ibas profeſſed this ſame Epiſtle to be his owne*: and *Ibas* of all men in the world knew beſt, whether it was his or no. I oppoſe laſtly *Baronius* to *Baronius*, for he [f] ſaith of this Epiſtle, *verè eſſe Ibæ fuiſſe cognitam, that it was knowne truly and indeed to be the Epiſtle of Ibas*. Say now in ſadneſſe, what you thinke of *Baronius*, and where you thinke his five wits were, when hee denyed, and that upon proofe by publike records, this to be the Epiſtle of *Ibas*, which the Popes Legates, with the whole Councell of *Chalcedon*, which Pope *Vigilius* whom hee defendeth, which *Ibas* his owne ſelfe,

a *Bar. an.* 448. *nu.* 71.
b *an. eod. nu.* 77.
c *Vigil. Conſt. nu.* 90
d *Bar. an.* 448. *nu.* 77.
e *Bar. an.* 553. *nu.* 211.
f *an.* 448. *nu.* 71.

ſelfe, yea which *Baronius* alſo acknowledgeth, confeſſeth, and profeſſeth to be truly, and in very deed the Epiſtle of *Ibas*.

10. But what ſhall we then ſay to thoſe publike acts, which as the Cardinall tells us, doe teſtifie, that this is not the Epiſtle of *Ibas*. *What firſt to the acts of the Councell at Chalcedon, which he firſt* g *alleageth, and the tenth Action thereof?* I ſay, and ſay it upon certaine grounds, that the Cardinall therein ſaith an untruth, for proofe whereof, I appeale to that ſame tenth Action of the Councell, in no part whereof it is ſaid, nor can thence be collected, that this was not the Epiſtle of *Ibas*. Or if you will not beleeve my ſaying, yet beleeve the Cardinall himſelfe, more then once teſtifying that which he ſaith to be untrue. Theſe are his words [h], *The Acts of the tenth Action of the Councell at Chalcedon: Eandem epiſtolam ut Iba cognitam eſſe à patribus docent, doe teach, that this Epiſtle was knowne to be the Epiſtle of Ibas.* And againe [i], *Vere eſſe Iba fuiſſe cognitam eandem actio decima docet, that this was knowne to have beene truly the Epiſtle of Ibas, the tenth action of the Councell at Chalcedon doth teach.* Thinke you not that *Baronius* is more like the *Eſopicall Satyr*, then a grave Cardinall of the Romane Church? At his firſt blaſt he makes the tenth action of the Councell at *Chalcedon* to teſtifie that this is not the Epiſtle of *Ibas*; and then hee blowes a quite contrary blaſt, profeſſing the tenth action of the Councell at *Chalcedon* to teſtifie that this is truly, and certainly the Epiſtle of *Ibas*.

g Bar. an. 431. nu. 71.

h Bar. an. 448. nu. 77.

i *Ibid.* nu. 71

11. O, but the ſecond *Nicene* Councell, and the publike acts thereof, they witneſſe the ſame which the Cardinall affirmeth, that this is not the Epiſtle of *Ibas*. They doe ſo indeed: But as it is an untruth in the Cardinalls mouth: ſo it is alſo in thoſe his Nicene Fathers from whom hee tooke it, unleſſe perhaps thoſe men of *Nice*, knew better whoſe Epiſtle it was, then did the 600 holy Biſhops of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, before whom *Ibas* ſtood, or better then *Ibas* himſelfe who confeſſed it to bee his owne Epiſtle. The Cardinall may not be offended that we diſſent from his Nicene Councell, which diſſenteth from the holy Councell at *Chalcedon*, from *Ibas* his owne confeſſion, yea from whom the Cardinall diſſenteth as much as we in this point. And I cannot ſee, what depth of wiſedome it was in his Cardinalſhip to alleage them for witneſſes, whoſe teſtimony, himſelfe in this very point for which he produceth them, doth avouch to bee untrue. But let him pleaſe himſelfe in thoſe Nice Fathers, we envie not ſuch a Councell, nor ſuch Fathers, nor ſuch publike records unto them. That Nicene aſſembly was but a conſpiracie againſt the truth, it was fit they ſhould uphold untruth, by untruth. And whoſoever ſhal be pleaſed to examine and rip up the Acts of that Councell, I will give him this one aſſured comfort, that beſides their ſuperſtitious & heretical doctrins therin maintained, he ſhall finde them full ſtuft with many groſſe and palpable untruths, of matters *de facto*, on which they build their doctri-

nall poſitions, as in this concerning the Epiſtle of *Ibas*, it is now moſt manifeſt.

12. For this time I will not enter into ſo ſpacious a field, but yet this one thing by the way I cannot but obſerve; ſeeing thoſe Nicene Fathers profeſſe, that writing againſt Image-worſhip, going under the name of *Epiphanius*, to be in ſuch ſort the book of *Epiphanius*, as this Epiſtle going under the name of *Ibas*, is the Epiſtle of *Ibas*: and ſeeing we have now demonſtrated this Epiſtle to be truly and indeed the Epiſtle of *Ibas*, it followeth even by their owne reaſon and compariſon, that the book alſo againſt Image-worſhip, cited by the Councell at *Conſtantinople* in the name of *Epiphanius*, is in truth and in very deed the true writing of Biſhop *Epiphanius*. And yet further, becauſe thoſe Nicene Fathers acknowledge *Epiphanius for a Catholike* [k] *Doctor of the Church*, one who held the ancient tradition [l] of the Church, and conſented to the Catholikes, in and before his time: it hence againe followeth, that the doctrine of condemning Image-worſhip which in that booke of *Epiphanius* is delivered, & was by the generall Councell at *Conſtantinople* ſome thirty [m] yeares before this Nicene Aſſembly, decreed [n], that it I ſay is ancient, Catholike, conſonant to the ancient tradition, and the doctrine of the ancient and catholike Fathers of the Church, even from the Apoſtles time. And this is all which *Baronius* hath gained by his alleaging thoſe publike acts of the Nicene Fathers, to prove this not to be the Epiſtle of *Ibas*. And let this ſuffice to be ſpoken of the perſonall untruths of *Vigilius* and *Baronius* touching this Epiſtle of *Ibas*, which are but a *preludium* to their doctrinall errors and hereſies; wherof in the next place we are to entreat.

k Beatam patrem (Epiphanium) catholicæ eccleſiæ Doctorem agnoſcimus. Conc. Nic. 2. Act. 6. pa. 371. b.

l Illi qui antiquam eccleſiæ traditionem recipiunt, beato Epiphanio non adverſantur. ibid. b.

m Conc. Conſt. contra Imagines, habitum eſt an. 754. Bin. to. 3. pa. 229. Conc. Nicenum habitum. an. 787. Bin. notis in id Conc.

n Qui imaginem auſus fuerit parare, aut adorare, aut in eccleſia, aut in privata domo conſtituere, aut clam habere, ſi Epiſcopus fuerit, deponatur. &c. Decretum Conc. Conſtant. ſub Conſtantino Copronimo, quod extat in Nicæno Conc. 2. Act. 6. pa. 377. a.

CHAP. XI.

That Vigilius *and* Baronius *in their former reaſon for defence of the Epiſtle of* Ibas, *drawne from* the union *with* Cyrill, *mentioned in the laſter part of that Epiſtle, doe defend all the hereſies of the Neſtorians.*

1. WE come now from perſonall matters to that which is the *Capital* point, and maine hereſie contained in the defence of *this Chapter*, wherein *Vigilius*, and *Baronius* have ſo behaved themſelves, that thoſe former errours though they be too ſhamefull, are but a very ſport, and play to that hereticall frenzie which here they doe expreſſe. For now you ſhall behold the Pope and his Cardinall in their lively colours, fighting under the banner of *Neſtorius*, and uſing the moſt cunning ſtratagems that were ever deviſed, to cloake their hereticall doctrine, and gaine credit to that condemned

demned hereſie. Thoſe ſleights are principally two. The former is gathered out of the latter part of the *Epiſtle* of *Ibas*, where mention is made of the *union* betwixt *Cyrill*, and *Iohn*, which although I touched before [a], yet becauſe it is a matter of greater obſcuritie, and containeth a moſt notable fraud of *Vigilius*, and *Baronius*, I purpoſely reſerved the full handling of it unto this place, where without interruption of other matters, I might have ſcope enough, to explaine the depth of this myſterie.

a *Sup. ca.4.*

2. In the time of the Epheſine Councell, there was, as all know, an exceeding breach betwixt *Cyrill*, with other Catholike Biſhops, who condemned *Neſtorius*, and *Iohn* Biſhop of *Antioch*, with divers other Eaſtern Biſhops, who tooke part with *Neſtorius*, againſt the holy Councell. And the diviſion was ſo great, that at the ſelfe-ſame time, in one, & the ſelfe-ſame citie of Epheſus, they held two ſeverall Councels, and ſet up *altare contra altare*, Councell againſt Councell, Patriarcke againſt Patriarcke, Biſhops againſt Biſhops, and Synodall ſentence againſt Synodall ſentence. But betwixt thoſe two Councels, there was as much difference, as is betwixt light and darkeneſſe, betwixt truth and hereſie, betwixt the Church of God, and the Synagogue of Satan. The one conſiſted of holy orthodoxall and Catholike Biſhops whoſe Preſident was *Cyrill*: the other of hereticall, [b] factious, and divers depoſed Biſhops, whoſe Preſident was *Iohn*. The former condemned *Neſtorius* & his blaſphemous doctrine, whereby hee denied Chriſt to be God: the latter defended *Neſtorius* and all his impious doctrines. The former was held in a Church, even in the Church of the Bleſſed [c] *Virgin*, whoſe Sonne they profeſſed to bee truly God: the latter in an Inne [d], or Taverne, a fit place for them who denied Chriſt to be God. The former proceeded in all reſpects, orderly and Synodally, as was fit and requiſite that they ſhould: the latter did all things tumultuouſly [e], preſumptuouſly, and againſt the Canons of the Church, ſupporting themſelves onely by lies, calumnies, and ſlanderous reports. In a word, the former, was truly an holy, a generall, an Oecumenicall [f] Councell, wherein was the conſent of the whole Catholike Church: the latter was nothing elſe, but an hereticall, ſchiſmaticall, and rebellious faction or conſpiracie of ſome thirtie [g] or fortie perſons, unworthy the name of Biſhops, inſolently oppoſing themſelves to the holy Councel, yea to the whole Catholike Church, in which number and faction beſides others, who leſſe concerne our purpoſe, were

b *Coactis in unum ſolo nomine Epiſcopis, qui unà cum Neſtorio deſciverãt: ex quibus alij erant extorres, vagi, propijs ſedibus deſtituti, alij à ſuis Metropolitanis depoſiti, alij, Pelagij & Cæleſtij veneno imbuti. Epi. Synodal. ſanct. Conc. Eph. ad Cæleſtinum, to. 4. Act. Eph. c. 17.*

c *Conſidentibus in ſanctiſſ. Eccleſ. quæ appellatur Mariæ, to. 2. act. Epheſ. cõc. ca. 1. & ſæpe alibi.*

d *Iohannes in diverſorio manẽte, ſacraq; illius Synodo præſente, Act. Epheſ. cõc. to. 3. ca. 1. Cum vix curru diſſiliſſet (Iohannes) cubiculũ ingreſſus eſſet. Apol. Cyril. ad Imper. to. 5 ca. 2. pa. 827. b.*

e *Iohannes cum ſuis, nullam omnino vel per leges eccleſiaſticas, vel per Auguſtorum decretum, poteſtatem obtinuit. Libel. Cyril. et Mem. oblatus ſ. Synodo, to. 4. Act. ca. 2. Johannes omni eccleſiaſtica authoritate proculcata, omniq; eccleſiarum ordine & ritu & conſuetudine contempta, &c. ibid. Quæ temerè vanèq; fuerant nugati, quæque præter omnem Canonum ordinem ediderant, &c. Epiſt. Synod. ad Imp. to. 4. ca. 8. quod contra leges et canones, omnemq; ordinem perpetrarunt, ibid.* f *Omnes Orientales atq; Occidentales vel per ſe, vel per legatos ſacerdotali huic conceſſui interfuerunt. Act. Epheſ. to. 2. ca. 16. Quod à nobis exijt judicium, aliud nihil eſſe quam cõmunem concordemque terrarum orbis ſenſum atq; conſenſum. Ep. Synod. Eph. Conc. ad Imp. to. 2. ca. 17.* g *Ille (Iohannes) 30. tantum numero, eoſque vel hæreticos vel alios illius factionis ſocios. Epiſt. Synod. 5. Conc. ad Imp. to. 4. ca. 2. Johannes rebellionis hujus auctor ſignatus. ibid. ca. 3. & alibi ſæpe.*

theſe [h] *Iohn* Biſhop of *Antioch*, the ring-leader of the reſt, *Paulus* Biſhop of *Emiſa*, *Theodoret* of whom wee before entreated, and *Ibas*, (not then, but ſome three or foure yeares after Biſhop of *Edeſſa*) whom to have beene preſent at that time as a Biſhop, though his name bee not expreſſed in their ſubſcription, both *Glicas* [i] in his Annales, and the Councell at *Chalcedon*, [k] and *Ibas* his owne words therein, doe make manifeſt.

3. Now though there was ſo great odds betwixt the holy Councell, and this factious conventicle, yet were they (as is the cuſtome of all hereticks and ſchiſmatickes) moſt inſolent in all their actions. As the holy Councell depoſed *Neſtorius* for an hereticke, ſo the Conventicle to cry quittance with them, depoſed [l] *Cyrill* for an Arch-hereticke alſo, condemning [m] his twelve Chapters as hereticall, which the holy Councell had approved as orthodoxall. As the holy Councell excommunicated [n] and anathematized, *Iohn*, *Paulus*, *Theodoret*, *Ibas*, and all the reſt of their factious adherents, and defenders of *Neſtorius*, and his hereſie: So did the Conventicle alſo excommunicate and anathematize *Cyrill*, and all [o] that tooke part with him, and defended his twelve Chapters, and ſo among theſe, even Pope *Celeſtine*, and the whole Catholike Church. As the holy Councell truly and juſtly, called themſelves; the ſacred and oecumenicall Councell, and tearmed *Iohn* with his adherents, a faction and hereticall [p] Conventicle of Neſtorians: ſo did the Conventicle arrogate unto themſelves, the glorious name of the holy [q] Epheſine Councell, and ſlandered them which held with *Cyrill* to bee a Conventicle [r], an unlawfull [s] and diſorderly aſſembly, tearming them *Arians*, [t] *Apollinarians*, and from *Cyrill*, *Cyrillians* [u]. As the holy Councell conſtantly refuſed, to communicate with *Iohn* [x], or any of his faction, untill they did cõſent to the depoſing of *Neſtorius*, and anathematizing his hereſie: ſo the conventicle moſt peeviſhly and pertinaciouſly not onely refuſed the communion with *Cyrill*, and other Catholikes, but bound themſelves by many ſolemne oathes, [y] and that even in the preſence of the Emperor, that they would never communicate with the *Cyrillians*, unleſſe they would condemne the twelve chapters of *Cyrill*, adding that they would rather dye [z], then admit or conſent unto any one of thoſe twelve chapters. Such an unhappie and lamentable breach *Iohn* and the Eaſtern Biſhops made in the Church at the time of that Epheſine Councell.

4. The religious Emperours *Theodoſius*, and *Valentinian* whoſe imperiall authority, was the onely meanes to end all theſe ſtrifes; had they beene perſonally preſent in the Synod, to ſee all theſe diſorders, they would no doubt, either have prevented this breach, or after it had hapned, have healed and made

h *Vt patet ex eorum ſubſcriptione. Act. Conc. Epheſ. to. 3. ca. 2. & tom. 4. ca. 7.*

i *Glic. Annal. part. 4. pa. 363.*

k *Poſt duos dies venimus in Epheſum ait Ibas in Epiſt. ſua. Conc. Chal. act. 10. ſequutus ſum primatem meum ibid. pa. 112. b.*

l *Tu Cyrille & tu Memnon, ſcitote vos exauctoratos, omnique epiſcopali honore exutos. to. 3. Act. Eph. ca. 2.*

m *Capita hereticæ à Cyrillo expoſita ut quæ Euangelicæ & Apoſtolicæ doctrinæ apertè repugnant. Ibid.*

n *Act. Conc. Epheſ. to. 4. ca. 7.*

o *At vos reliqui omnes qui Cyrilli actis conſenſiſtis, anathemati ſubjacete. tom. 3. Epheſ. Act. ca. 2.*

p *Schiſmaticorum conciliabulum. to. 4. Act. Conc. Ephe. ca. 15.*

q *Sacra Synodus, &c. tom. 3. act. ca. 2. 6. 7. & alibi ſæpe*

r *Confuſo illorum Conciliabulo ſe conjunxerunt. tom. 3. act. Epheſ. ca. 1. Quoddam inter ſe conciliabulum inſtituerunt. ibid. c. 4.*

s *Seditioſe, iniquè, contra eccleſiaſticas ſanctiones, regiaq; decreta conſenſiſtis. ibid. ca. 2.*

t *Qui furijs quibuſdam agitati, Arij, Apollinarijque dogmata inſtaurare voluerunt. to. 3. ca. 18.*

u *Scitote Cyrillianos tyrannide, fraudibus, &c. Append. ad to. 3. act. Epheſ. ca. 10.*

x *To. 4. act. ca. 15. & ca. 18.*

y *Iuravimuſq; ſæpiſſimè pientiſſimo Regi, quod impoſſibile ſit nobis cõmunicare his (Cyrillianis) ſi non explẽſerint capitula. Appen. to. 3. act. ca. 9. & 10.*

z *Parati ſumus prius mori, quam ſuſcipere unum ex Cyrilli capitulis. ib. ca. 7.*

up

upp the ſame. But they reſiding then at *Conſtantinople*, were extreamely abuſed by the vile dealings of the Neſtorians, for ſo much had theſe Neſtorians prevailed, both at the Court and in the Citie of *Conſtantinople*, where *Neſtorius* had beene Biſhop, that though the holy Councell ſent letters after letters, to certifie the truth of all matters to the Emperor, yet either [a] were their meſſengers ſtopt, or their letters by the malicious vigilancie of the Neſtorians intercepted, ſo that none, no not any ſmall notice of them came to the Emperors, whereas on the other part the frequent [b] letters of the conventicle fraught with lies & ſlanders, had every day acceſſe, yea applauſe in the Citie, in the Court, and before the Emperors. And which was the worſt of all, Count *Candidianus*, whom the Emperours made their owne deputie, and preſident of the Councell, to ſee all good, and Synodall orders obſerved therein, hee failed of that truſt committed unto him, and being moſt partiall [c] towards *Neſtorius* and his hereſie, by his letters alſo he ſeconded and ſoothed all the lies which the conventicle had writ unto the Emperors. By which meanes it came to paſſe, that the Emperors knowing nothing of that diviſion amongſt the Biſhops, & how beſide the holy Councell, there was a factious, and ſchiſmaticall conventicle held in the citie, thought all that was done, as well againſt *Cyrill*, and *Memnon*, in depoſing them, as againſt *Neſtorius*, in depoſing him, that all this had beene in the act, judgement and ſentence of one and the ſame Councell, upon which ſubreption and miſinformation, the Emperors confirmed at the firſt the condemnation [d] of them all three; But at length a letter being brought from the holy Synod to *Conſtantinople* by one, who to avoid ſuſpition put on the habit of a begger [e], and carried the letter in the trunke of his hollow ſtaffe which for that purpoſe he had provided; as ſoone as the report of theſe ſtrange diſorders came to the Emperors eares, they ſent for, and commanded certaine Biſhops of either ſide, perſonally to come before them to *Conſtantinople*, that they might bee fully informed of the truth in all the proceedings: and the truth after diligent examination being found, the Emperors by their Imperiall authoritie adnulled all the Acts of the conventicle, reſtored *Cyrill* [f], and *Memnon*, approved [g] the judgement of the holy Councell againſt *Neſtorius*, adding baniſhment alſo from *Conſtantinople*, to his depoſition: But the Synodall ſentence [h] of depoſition againſt *Iohn*, and the other Biſhops of his faction, that they ſtaied, and ſuſpended for a while, partly to prevent a greater ſchiſme, which *Iohn* was like to procure, but ſpecially in hope that *Iohn*, and the other Eaſterne Biſhops might in time be

a *Arbitramur piiſſ. Imperatorem nihil horum dilucidè intellexiſſe. Ita tuta mariq; obſidemur, ut nihil eorum quæ nobis hic evenerint veſtræ Sanctitudini ſignificare potuerimus. Epiſt. ſan. conc. ad Tulalium & alios. tom. 4. act. ca. 21. Qui Neſtorij ſtudioſi erant, omnia maria & publicas vias obſidentes, neminem prorſus à ſacra Synodo Conſtantinopol. venire permittunt. to. 2. act Epheſ ca. 19.*

b *Ea interim quæ inimici Chriſti erant, ultro citroque deferebantur. ibid.*

c *Candidianus Comes amicitiam Neſtorij pietati anteponens — ea pietati veſtræ inſtillare ſtuduit, quæ cum ſibi tum Neſtorio commoda gratæq; futura intelligebat. Relatio Synod. ad Imp. to. 4. ca. 10.*

d *Et Neſtorij, & Cyrilli, et Memnonis exauctorationem à Sanctitate veſtra nobis inſinuatam, calculo noſtro approbavimus. Sacra miſſa ab Auguſto ad Synod. to. 3. act. Epheſ. ca. 15.*

e *Epiſtola ex Epheſo ſcripta, opera cujuſdam mendici, qui in Scipione eam incluſam gerebat, tandem reddita eſt. tom. 2. act. ca. 19.*

f *Placuit pientiſſ. Regi ut Ægyptius et Memnonius in ſuis locis manerent. Epiſt. Legatorum Conciliab. Append. tom. 3. ca. 10. pa. 791. b. et ille (Cyrillus) ad thronum ſuum rediit. Ibid.* g *Legatorum Synodi ſententia publicè approbata, Orientales quidem condemnat, Neſtorio vero exilium indicit. Decretum Regium, tom. 5. act. Epheſ. ca. 11.*

h *Quæ extat tom. 4. act ca. 7.* i *Imperator decrevit ut ſententia Oecumenica Synodi contra Neſtorium vim obtineret, quod ſi in cauſa tolumnia conſtitiſſet, ſuſpenderetur. Bin. not. in Conc. Epheſ. § Verum. pa. 921.*

reduced

reduced and brought to unitie with *Cyrill*, and the catholike Church, which in that height of their heat and ſtomacke could not have beene expected. And thus was the Councell at *Epheſus* diſſolved, a farre greater rent by this means being left at the end, then had beene at the beginning thereof, and ſo that maladie for which it was called, not cured but encreaſed.

5. But the religious Emperor *Theodoſius* could not bee at quiet while the Church was thus diſturbed, but the very next yeare after the Epheſine Councell was ended, when time and better adviſe had now cooled the former heat of the Eaſterne Biſhops, hee began to effect that union which before he had entended, and he ſo earneſtly laboured therein, that himſelfe profeſſed, [k] *I am certainely and firmely reſolved, not to deſiſt in working this reconcilement, untill God ſhall vouchſafe to reſtore unitie and peace to the Church*; To which purpoſe hee writ a very religious, and effectuall Epiſtle [l] to *Iohn* B. of *Antioch*, by many reaſons perſwading, and by his imperiall authoritie commanding [m] him, and with him the reſt of the faction, to ſubſcribe to the depoſition of *Neſtorius*, & the anathematizing of his hereſie, and ſo to embrace the holy communion with *Cyrill*, and the catholike Church, which perſwaſions of the Emperor, tooke indeed the intended effect: for after ſome tergiverſation for a while, both *Iohn* and moſt of the Eaſterne Biſhops, before the end of that yeare, relented, and in a Synod held at *Antioch*, ſubſcribed as the Emperor perſwaded them, both to the depoſing of *Neſtorius*, and to a truly orthodoxall profeſſion, ſent unto them by *Cyrill*, wherein they approved [n] the holy Epheſine Councell, and condemned all the hereſies of *Neſtorius*, and upon this their conſenting to *Cyrill*, and the orthodoxall faith, were received into the peace of the Church; and ſo union and concord, was fullie concluded betwixt *Cyrill*, with the other orthodoxall Biſhops, & *Iohn* with moſt of thoſe Eaſtern Biſhops, who before adhered unto him.

6. Let us now ſee how *Vigilius*, and after him *Baronius* under couler of this *Vnion*, plead for *Ibas*, & his heretical Epiſtle. In the end of that *Epiſtle*, *Ibas* makes mention [o], of the union betwixt *Iohn* and *Cyrill*, yea mentioneth it as a great bleſſing of [p] God to the Church, ſeeing that he not onely conſented, but greatly rejoyced at the ſame. Thus much is cleare and certaine by the Epiſtle. Now becauſe the *Vnion* as we have declared, was made by conſenting to the Catholike faith, it ſeemes that *Ibas* who conſented to the *Vnion*, conſented alſo to the Catholike faith, and ſo was received into the communion of *Cyrill* and the Catholike Church. Seeing then *Ibas* by this Epiſtle is ſhewed to approve and embrace the *Vnion*, and embracing of the union is the proofe of a Catholike, it followeth that even by this Epiſtle *Ibas* declares himſelfe to be a very good Catholike, and an earneſt embracer of the Catholike faith. This is the ſumme of their collection, which is, as any wil confeſſe, a very faire & plauſible pretence, and therefore more fit for the Pope and Cardi-

k *Sacr. Imp. ad Acatium Epiſc. Ber. to. 5. act. Epheſ. ca. 10.*

l *Sacr. Imp. miſſa per Ariſtol. ad Iohannem, tom. 5. act. Epheſ. ca. 3.*

m *Iohanni mandavit ut ſcelerata Neſtorij dogmata anathematizaret &c. Epiſt. Cyril. ad Dyn. to. 5. act. Epheſ. ca. 16. Imperatores literas miſerunt ad Acatium Beroenſem et Iohannem, quibus ſeverè præcipiunt, ut turbas conſopiamus. Epiſt. Pauli ad Cyril. to. 5. act. Eph. ca. 4.*

n *Cum igitur Iohannes ſubſcripſiſſet cæteris, qui majori authoritate apud ipſum erant, et Neſtorij dogmata anathematizaſſent, cõmunionem illis reſtituimus. Epiſt. Cyril. ad Dynat. to. 5. ca. 16.*

o *Et communicantibus adinvicem, cõtentio de medio ablata eſt, et pax in Eccleſia facta. Ibæ verba in ſua Epiſt.*

p *Voluit autem Deus, qui ſuæ ſemper curam gerit Eccleſiæ. Ibid.*

nall to cloake their hereſie under the ſhew thereof. But leaſt we ſeeme either to wrong them, or leave out ought which is emphaticall in their reaſon, it is needfull to heare them diſpute in their owne words.

7. It differeth much, ſaith [q] *Baronius*, to ſay that the Epiſtle is Catholike, or that thoſe things which are written in it are true, and to ſay that *Ibas* by this *Epiſtle* was proved to be a catholike. *Etenim nihil aliud inde acceperunt patres, niſi Ibam tunc temporis fuiſſe Catholicum, for the fathers at Chalcedon tooke nothing at all out of that Epiſtle, but that Ibas at that time* (when he writ it) *was a Catholike*, ſeeing in it is demonſtrated that *Ibas* who had ſometimes erred with the Neſtorians, and dealt againſt *Cyrill*, after the peace once made, did communicate with *Cyrill*, and condemne *Neſtorius* with his doctrine. Againe, [r] the reader is here to be admoniſhed, that the ſentence of the fathers at *Chalcedon* doth not tend to this end, *ut voluerint probaſſe Epiſtolam Iba, as if they meant to approve the Epiſtle of Ibas*, in which there are many blaſphemies affirmed, neither did *Vigilius* meane to teach this: *ſed tantum ex ea recipiendum eſſe Ibam, in qua nimirum teſtetur ipſe ſe jam amplecti pacem eccleſiæ, qua recepta, neceſſe fuerit eundem probare Catholicum, but both they and* Vigilius *meant onely that* Ibas, *by this Epiſtle was to be eſteemed and embraced as a Catholike*, ſeeing in this Epiſtle *Ibas* teſtifieth that he embraced the peace of the Church, which being received, it is neceſſary that he be approved for a catholike. Againe, the [s] Fathers of *Chalcedon*, ſaid, *that this Epiſtle was to be received as Catholike*, not in regard of thoſe errors wherewith *Ibas* was once intangled, and which are recited therein, *ſed quod ex illa Ibas profitetur ſe pacì initæ conſentire; but for that Ibas in it profeſſeth himſelfe to conſent to the peace or union made betweene Iohn and Cyrill:* and a little after, *Vides* [t] *non alia ex parte, you ſee that this Epiſtle was approved by the Fathers at Chalcedon in no other part or reſpect*; but for that which *Ibas* ſignifieth in the laſt part of the Epittle, that hee conſented, *omnibus pactis & conventis*, in all the conditions and covenants of the catholike *union* made betweene *Iohn* and *Cyrill*. And to omit many the like places, (for *Baronius* harps much upon this ſtring) hee repeateth this [u] moſt plainly in this manner: *In the end of this Epiſtle, Ibas the author of it doth teſtifie, that peace was made, that himſelfe conſented unto it, and rejoyceth therein, ſeeing he gives thankes to God for the ſame.* Now ſeeing the peace was concluded upon this condition, that *Neſtorius* and his errours ſhould be condemned, and the decrees of the *Epheſine* Councell received, it did plainely and neceſſarily enſue, that *Ibas* condemned *Neſtorius*, and approved the *Epheſine* Councell, and ſo the Popes Legates, and others at *Chalcedon* ſpake not amiſſe, when they ſaid, that *Ibas* by that Epiſtle being read, was proved to bee a catholike. Thus diſputeth the Cardinall for this impious *Epiſtle*, nor did he wholly deviſe this of himſelfe, but he had the ground of it out of *Vigilius* his *Apoſtolicall*

q Bar. an. 448. nu. 75.

r Bar. an. 553. nu. 191.

s Ibid.

t Nu. 192.

u Ad. eodem 553. nu. 213.

x Vigil. Conſt. num. 192.

licall Conſtitutiõ, where he thus ſaith, *The* x *Fathers at Chalcedon pronounced this Epiſtle of Ibas to be orthodoxall, propter illam praedicationem fidei, for that profeſſion of faith*, by which *Cyrill* and *Iohn*, and all the Eaſterne Biſhops made concord and union by the meanes of *Paulus* Biſhop of *Emiſa, quam Ibas quoque in eâdem Epiſtolâ laudans libenter amplectitur; which union and profeſſion of faith Ibas both praiſeth in this Epiſtle, and gladly embraceth.* So *Vigilius*.

8. Here firſt of all muſt be obſerved the admirable acuteneſſe of the Pope and the Cardinall: They can ſee in the *Epiſtle* of *Ibas*, more than the whole fift generall Councell, than other ſucceeding, either Popes or generall Councels; more than the whole Catholike Church ever did, or could; more than all the world beſides, excepting onely the Neſtorians: They, and none but they of all the former could ſee by the latter end of that *Epiſtle*, or by the *union* mentioned therein, that either the *Epiſtle* was Catholike, or *Ibas* by it to be judged a Catholike. But *Vigilius* and *Baronius*, though in ſome matters they be as blinde as a Beetle, yet when they liſt, (*and they ever liſt when they defend hereſie*) they can ſee farre into a Milſtone: And yet, if it be well conſidered, they gaine not much by this their quicke ſight, and quirke of the *union*, which they have ſpied in the end of that *Epiſtle*; for the whole fift Councell (approved by ſucceeding Councels, and by the whole catholike Church, as before wee have declared) adjudgeth, not onely the beginning, and the middle, but the end alſo, even the whole y Epiſtle, and every part; above all, and principally; the end z thereof, to be blaſphemous, and hereticall, they anathematize a alſo as heretikes all who defend either the whole Epiſtle, or any part thereof, yea, all who doe not anathematize every part thereof: whence it is undeniably conſequent, that both *Vigilius*, and his Procter *Baronius*, and all who doe, or ſhall hereafter herein defend them, yea, all who doe not anathematize them, are for this very quirke and ſubtilty of the *union* found in the latter part of this Epiſtle, anathematized, and condemned by the conſenting judgment of the whole catholike Church. This have they gained as a juſt recompence for defending but the end onely of that *Epiſtle*, and much more for defending it by pretence of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, though they ſhould condemne all the reſt of it.

y Tota Epiſtola haretica eſt, tota Epiſtola blaſphema eſt, hoc omnes dicimus. Conc. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 576. b.

z Poſteriora inſerta Epiſtolæ maſore impietate plena ſunt. Conc. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 564 a.

a Si quis defendit memoratam Epiſtolam, & non anathematizat eam, et defenſores ejus, et eos qui dicunt eam rectam eſſe, vel partem ejus. Conc. 5. Coll. 8. in ſententia Synodali. Anath. 14.

9. But if the matter be well conſidered, it will appeare that *Vigilius* by this one clauſe of the *union* makes good, not only the latter part, (as *Baronius* pretendeth) but even the whole Epiſtle of *Ibas*; for had he intended to approve no more than onely the latter part of that Epiſtle, his reaſon had beene this; The Fathers at *Chalcedon* approved that part of the Epiſtle, wherein the *union* is mentioned; therefore they approve the latter part of the Epiſtle, which is a meere nugation, proving *idem per idem*; for ſeeing the *union* is onely mentioned in the latter part, it is all one as if he had ſaid, They approved the latter part, therefore they approved

approved the latter part; and mee thinkes it ſounds not well, to heare ſuch nugatory, and frivolous reaſons to proceed out of the *infallible Chaire*: Nor doth indeed *Vigilius* ſo conclude, but from that *union* and concord which the latter part of the Epiſtle teſtifieth *Ibas* to have approved, he inferres, that *Ibas* when hee writ this was a Catholike, and writ it as a Catholike, and ſo the writing, or Epiſtle it ſelfe to be Catholike; for thus ſtands his reaſon; The [b] latter end of the Epiſtle ſheweth, that *Ibas* praiſed the *union* betwixt *Iohn* and *Cyrill*, and gladly embraceth it; and *propter illam fidei prædicationem orthodoxa eſt Ibæ à patribus pronunciata dictatio; therefore for that confeſſion of faith, which Ibas by his Epiſtle ſheweth that he embraceth,* for that did the Fathers of *Chalcedon* pronounce the writing, or Epiſtle (not the end onely of it) to be orthodoxall: So he takes this one part, of which hee made no doubt but it was approved at *Chalcedon*, as a *Medium* to prove that which was doubted, to wit, that the Epiſtle it ſelfe, even the whole Epiſtle was by the ſame Fathers approved; yea, and *Baronius* alſo, though hee in words pretends the contrary, yet ſeemes to be indeed of the ſame judgement, for he uſeth the very like reaſon as *Vigilius* doth, *quod* [c] *ex illa*, becauſe *Ibas* in this Epiſtle profeſſeth himſelfe to conſent to the *union*, therefore *Patres dixerunt eam Epiſtolam ut Catholicam recipiendam*; the Fathers at *Chalcedon* ſaid, that the Epiſtle (loe the Epiſtle, ſaith the Cardinall, not a part onely of it) ought to bee received as Catholike.

b *Vig. Conſt. nu. 192.*

c *Bar. an. 553. nu. 191.*

10. Which will be more plaine if we obſerve one other point out of *Vigilius* and *Baronius*, which may not well be omitted; for whereas all contained in any part of the Epiſtle reſpects things done, either before, or at, or after the *union*, in none of theſe, if ye will beleeve them, is this writing hereticall, or againſt the faith; for what was done before the *union*, though therein much be ſpoke againſt *Cyrill*, & the *Epheſine* Councell, and *Cyrill* called an heretike, yet is all that, ſaith [d] *Baronius*, ſpoken by way of an hiſtorical narration, as declaring what was done, not as allowing that which was done; *ut ex hac parte nihil adverſus Cyrillum obloquutus videatur, that in this part there is no wrong done to Cyrill.* At the *union*, or when it was concluded, then was *Ibas* reconciled to *Cyrill*, and received to the communion of the Church, and ſo would not write againſt the faith, ſo teacheth the Cardinall, *Ibas*, ſaith [e] he, tooke part with *Neſtorius, uſque ad tempus per Paulum Emiſſenum, untill the time that the union was made by Paul Biſhop of Emiſa, quando ipſe ſicut alij, communicare cum S. Cyrillo, & Eccleſia Catholica capit; at which time Ibas, as the reſt, began to communicate with Cyrill, and with the Catholike Church. Vigilius* [f] noteth the ſame, and out of him *Baronius* ſeemes to have borrowed it. By *Paulus* Biſhop of *Emiſa*, *Iohn, atque omnes orientales Epiſcopi, and all the Eaſterne Biſhops*, (then *Ibas* among them) returned to concord with *Cyrill*. And *Baronius* further by the Epiſtle it ſelfe makes

d *Bar. an. 448. nu. 71. Epiſtola hiſtoriam continet rerum geſtarum inter Iohannem & Cyrillum, et quæ inter eos tranſacta eſſent, refert, &c.*

e *An. eodem. nu. 59.*

f *Vigil. Conſt. nu. 192.*

makes this plaine, for by it, ſaith [g] he, is declared, that *Ibas*, though before that time he had doated, *tunc temporis fuiſſe Catholicum, yet then* (to wit, when he writ this) *he was a Catholike*; and *Ibas* writ this Epiſtle, *eodem* [h] *momento pacis initæ, at the verie time and moment when the peace was made and concluded*; after which he never ſpake one undecent word againſt *Cyrill*: ſo at the time of the *union* being a Catholike, hee would not oppugne or write againſt the faith; much leſſe after the time of the *union*, for after that time *Vigilius* [i] teſtifieth, that *Ibas* remained ſtill a catholike, and in the catholike communion, *uſque ad exitum, even to his dying day*: And *Baronius* expreſſeth the ſame, ſaying [k], that after the *union* it could not bee proved, *aliquod verbum indecens adverſus Cyrillum protuliſſe; that Ibas ſpake any unſeemely word againſt Cyrill.* Hereupon now it followeth, that the whole Epiſtle is to be approved, written by *Ibas* when he was a catholike, written with a catholike minde and affection; by him, who both at, and after the *union* would not write againſt the faith which himſelfe profeſſed, and what is ſpoken of matters before the *union*, that is all hiſtorically narrated, not by aſſent approved.

g Bar. an. 448. nu. 75.

h Ba. an. 553. nu. 211

Vig. conſt. nu. 194

k Bar. an. 553. nu. 211.

11. Oh how doe theſe men even labour and ſtudy to be miſerable, and to tye more faſt the knots of thoſe Anathemaes denounced againſt them by the holy Councell, which nothing but renouncing their hereticall defences of this Epiſtle can ever diſſolve! what will they doubt or feare to ſay, who would juſtifie that whole Epiſtle, as affirming nothing repugnant to the faith, (for a narration is no aſſertion of that which is related) of which the holy Conncell, and catholike Church hath pronounced, that it is wholly hereticall; and every part, head and taile, beginning and ending, an abſolute, and poſitive deniall of the faith? what untruth will they not avouch, who deny *Ibas* after the *union* to have injured *Cyrill*, whereas the holy generall Councell witneſſeth, and that truly, as you ſhall ſtraight ſee, that even in this *union* which *Ibas* mentioneth, he wrongeth *Cyrill* and all catholikes more, than in any part of his Epiſt. yea, more thã *Neſtorius* himſelf ever did. But omitting for this time al the other untruths, which are not a few in thoſe aſſertions of *Vigilius* and *Baronius*; there are two things therein, which I may not wel paſſe over in ſilence.

12. The former is, (at the conſideration whereof I could not refraine from laughter) how curious, and even ſuperſtitious the Cardinall is in calculating the nativity of this impious Epiſtle, as if he had performed the office of *Iuno Lucina* unto it, and knew the very moment of time when this faire babe was firſt brought to light: It was written, ſaith hee, *eodem momento pacis initæ, in that very moment when the union was made betwixt Iohn and Cyrill.* At that very moment? Sure the Cardinals *Ephemerides*, or the conſtellations deceived him. It was neither written in that moment, nor in that moneth, nor in that yeare, nor at the leaſt two whole yeares after the *union* was concluded: for the Epiſtle mentioneth

tioneth, not onely the praise of *Theodorus* of *Mopsvestia*, but his commendation by *Rambulas*. Now, neither did the Nestorians so much honour, nor did the catholikes by name condemne *Theodorus*, till the Emperour had by his Edict straightly forbidden the reading, writing, hearing, or having of the bookes of *Nestorius*; till then the name and writings of *Nestorius*, being a Patriarke, and of so eminent a citie as *Constantinople*, was farre more fit to credit, and countenance their doctrines, than the name of *Theodorus*, being but a Bishop, and of a very obscure and ignoble towne, or corner rather, which in likelihood had beene buried in eternall oblivion, had not he by his owne infamy made it famous, as *Heroſtratus* [l] did himselfe by burning the temple of *Diana* at *Epheſus*: But when both the name and bookes of *Nestorius* was now so detested by reason of the imperiall Edict, *tunc cæperunt Theodori volumina circumferre*, saith *Liberatus*, *then* [m] *they began but to disperse the writings of Theodorus*, wch *Baronius* [n] also confesseth; when the rivers, that is, *Nestorius* was stopt by the Emperors law, then the Nestorians *ipsum fontem aperuere*, *opened the very fountaine*, divulging the bookes of *Theodorus*, and *Diodorus*. The *Epistle* then, mentioning the expresse condemning of *Theodorus*, doth of a certaintie follow that imperiall Edict against *Nestorius*: That Edict was published, as by the date [o] appeares, in *August*, when *Theodosius* was the fifteenth time [p] Consull. The *union* betwixt *John* and *Cyrill* was made the next yeare after the Ephesine Councell: for *John* writing to *Xistus* Bishop of *Rome*, and testifying his unitie [q] and consent to *Cyrill*, saith in that Epistle, that the Ephesine Councell was held *anno proximè lapso*, *the yeare next before*. The Councell at *Epheſus* both began and ended in the yeare when *Antiochus* [r] and *Bassus* were Consuls [s]. Betwixt *Valerius* and *Ætius*, (who were next Consuls after *Antiochus* and *Bassus*, and in whose Consulship the union was fully concluded,) and the fifteenth Consulship of *Theodosius*, wherein the Edict against *Nestorius* was published, are two intire Consulships [t], as by the *Fasti*, and others is certaine. So that it is certaine, that the Epistle which mentioneth the condemning by name of *Theodorus*, was not written till more then two compleat yeares after the union ended: but how long after these two yeares it was, before *Ibas* writ it, is wholy uncertaine, in likelihood it was two or three more: for some time after the Edict must boe allowed for the Nestorians, to translate first, and then disperse the bookes of *Theodorus*: some more after that, for the condemning of him by *Rambulas*: some againe after that, before *Rambulas* dyed, to whom *Ibas* succeeded in the Bishopricke of *Edessa*; and who writ this Epistle, when hee was in possession of that See, as both the title [u] and contents [x] of the Epistle declare. By all which,

l Heroſtratus, ut nomen memoriæ scelerius extenderet, incendium nobilis fabricæ (quod inter 7. orbis miracula unũ erat) manu sua struxit, sicut ipse fassus est. Solin. ca. 33. Strab. li. 14. & Val. Max. tit. de Cupidit. gloriæ. lib. 8. ca. 14.

m Liber. ca. 10.

n Bar. an. 435. nu. 3.

o Leg. ult. de hæreticis cod. Theod.

p Is est annus Ch. 435, ut docet Marc. in Chron. & Bar. in illum annum.

q Placuit & nobis quæq; in sacræ synodi sententia acquiescere. Epist. Iohannis ad Xistum. Act. Conc. Eph. to. 1. ca. 17.

r Act. Conc. Ephes. to. 2. ca. 1. ubi habita dicitur Synodus post Coss. 13. Theodosij. anno autem post istum Consulatum, Antiochus & Bassus erant Consules, ut ex Marcell. in Chron. & fastis certum est. & to. 3. Act. Eph. ca. 17. literæ Imper. ad Synodum datæ sunt Antiocho Consule. Cæpit autem Concilium 23. die Maij eo anno. to. 2. Act. ca 1. & finitum est post quatuor (ut Liber. ca. 7.) vel post 3. menses ut Socrates ait. lib. 7. ca. 33. & 37.

s Is est an. Ch. 431. Marc. in Ch. & Bar. in eum annum.

t An. 433. Theodosius 14. et Maximus Coss. an. 434. Ariobinda & Aspar. Coss. an. 435. Theodosius 15. et Valent. 4. Coss. Fasti.

u Marcell. et Bar. x Fragmentum Epistolæ Ibæ Episcopi Edessini Conc. Chalc. Act. 10.

Ex quibus unus (qui Theodorum condemnat) extitit falso alicubi scribitur extitit) nostræ civitatis tyrannus, Ibæ in sua Epist. loc. citat. tyranni autem nomine significari Rambulam testatur Liber. ca. 10. ubi sic ait, De quo (Rabula) successor ejus Ibas in epistola sua dixit prius (Theodorum) pr æsumpsit, qui omnia præsumit, aperuit in ecclesiasua anathematizare, etc.

and if there were none elſe, by the laſt onely, that *Ibas* writ this, being Biſhop of *Edeſſa*, it is cleere, that ſome good while, in likelihood three or foure yeares, were paſt after the *union*, before *Ibas* writ this Epiſtle, of which *Baronius* tells us ſo preciſely, that it was writ, *eo momento*, *at the very moment*, and inſtant when the peace was concluded.

13. The other point, to be obſerved is, what manner of a Catholike Pope *Vigilius*, and Cardinall *Baronius* have here ſet forth unto us. *Ibas* when he writ this Epiſtle, is with them a Catholike, a Catholike Writer, a Catholike Biſhop; in him you ſhall ſee the lively portrature of one of their Catholikes. Hee even in this Epiſtle, written after the *Vnion* (when he was as they teach [y], a Catholike) *denyeth God to be incarnate*, and *Marie to be the Mother of God*: he condemnes the holy Epheſine Councell, and the twelve Chapters of *Cyrill*, hee commends *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia* for a Preacher of the truth, while he lived, for a Saint being dead. Theſe are the doctrines of *Ibas*, all of them taught poſitively, and avouched, (not as the Cardinall fancieth, hiſtorically related) in his Epiſtle, as the words [z] thẽſelves do ſhew, & the whole fift Councell [a] witneſſeth, all taught by him, after the *Vnion*, when he was one of the Popes and Cardinalls Catholikes, yea taught conſonantly to the *Vnion* which *Ibas* then embraced; yet *Ibas* teaching, writing, and maintaining all theſe blaſphemies and hereſies, that is, oppugning with all his art and ability the whole Catholike faith, is crowned and canonized by *Vigilius* and *Baronius* for a good Catholike. Of ſuch Catholikes their Romane Church hath great ſtore; nay, ſeeing none is now of their Church, who approves not all the Cathedrall decrees of their Popes, and therefore this of *Vigilius* among the reſt, it hence enſueth, that none is now a Romane Catholike, that is, a member of their preſent Romane Church, who approves not *Ibas*, ſuch as he was when he writ this Epiſtle, for a Catholike, that is, who approves not the moſt blaſphemous heretikes, and oppugners of the whole faith, to be Catholikes, and who condemnes not the *Cyrillians*, that is, all that maintaine the Catholike faith, for heretikes.

14. But ſtill as yet the doubt concerning the *Vnion* remaineth: *Ibas*, ſay they, when he writ this Epiſtle embraced the *union* with *Cyrill*, and none can embrace that *union* but hee ſhewes himſelfe thereby to bee a Catholike. True; none can truly and ſincerely embrace that *union* which *Cyrill* made with *Iohn*, the condition whereof was the ſubſcribing to the holy Epheſine Synode, and condemning of *Neſtorius*, with his doctrines, but hee is and muſt be acknowledged to be a good Catholike. Had *Ibas* approved that *union* or conſented unto it; *Ibas* had not beene *Ibas*, he had never written that impious Epiſtle, which in every part, & moſt of all in the end, where hee ſpeakes of the *union*, is repugnant to that holy *union*. It is the *union* in Neſtorianiſme, the union in oppugning

[y] *Vig. Conſt. nu. 194. & Ibam tunc temporis (cum hanc Epiſtolam momento ipſo unionis ſcripſit) Catholicum fuiſſe. Bar. an. 448. nu. 75.*

[z] *Vide Epiſtolam ipſam, & hoc clarum erit.*

[a] *Conc. 5. coll. 6. pa. 575. & 576.*

pugning and overthrowing the whole Catholike faith, which *Ibas* when he writ this Epiſtle embraced, and which in his Epiſtle he commendeth, which that it may appeare to all, wee are now to unfold the myſtery of that *union* with *Cyrill*, under colour whereof *Ibas* firſt, then *Vigilius*, and laſtly *Baronius* with all who hold the Popes judgement to bee *infallible*, doe very cunningly convey their hereticall doctrines, and contradict the Catholike faith.

15. The Neſtorians being loth to forſake, or have it thought that any of them did forſake their hereſies, and being withall moſt deſperately given to lying and ſlandering, ſet forth a forme of union, forged by themſelves, wherein they made *Cyrill*, and all who conſented to him, that is, all Catholikes, to condemne their former Catholike doctrine decreed at the Epheſine Synod, and to aſſent to their hereſies. And, as if this had beene the true union, and the conditions of peace agreed upon betwixt *Cyrill* and *Iohn*, they every where buzzed this into the eares of their ſectaries, and ſpred abroad the copies thereof, triumphing in it, that now they had wonne the field, that *Cyrill* and all his partakers had now conſented to Neſtorianiſme; and that upon this conſent a generall union and peace enſued in the Church. This and no other is the union which *Ibas* in his Epiſtle embraceth, and by conſenting whereunto Pope *Vigilius* decreeth, and *Baronius* defendeth *Ibas* to be a Catholike, to which union whoſoever conſenteth, or approveth others, conſenting to it; they doe even by that one act, beſides all the reſt, infallibly demonſtrate themſelves, not onely to be Neſtorians, and to approve all the hereſies and blaſphemies of *Neſtorius*, but to be in the moſt baſe, abject, and low degree of all Neſtorians, even ſuch as by lyes and calumnies ſtrive to uphold their hereſies.

16. For proofe whereof, I ſhall produce records above exception: and firſt of all *Cyrills* owne teſtimony. *Acatius* the worthy Biſhop of *Meletene* hearing by the report which the Neſtorians [b] had ſpred abroad, that *Cyrill* in making the union had conſented to the Neſtorian doctrine of two natures (making *two perſons*) in Chriſt, contrarie to his owne 12. Chapters, certified *Cyrill* of this report: *Cyrill* writ unto him at large, declaring the contrarie, and aſſuring him, that it was but a meere calumnie deviſed againſt him: *They reprove and accuſe us, ſaith he* [c], *as if formerly, we had thought the quite contrarie to thoſe things which now* (at the union) *we have written*, and I underſtand that they object alſo unto us, *quod novam fidei expoſitionem vel ſymboli receperimus, that we have now* (at the union) *embraced a new Creed, or new expoſition of the faith*, rejecting that old and venerable Creed: Thus did the Neſtorians accuſe *Cyrill*, as himſelfe teſtifieth: but what anſwered he for himſelfe? *At ſtultus ſtulta loquitur, & cor ejus vana meditatur*, he calls them in plaine termes, fooles and lyars: *the foole ſpeaketh fooliſhly, and his heart meditateth lyes*. And in the end

b *Ex altera parte quidam de palatio culpaverunt Cyrillum, cur ſuſceperit ab orientalibus Epiſcopis duarum confeſſionem naturarum, quod Neſtorius dixit & docuit. hoc ipſi Valeriano, & Acatio videbatur.* Liber. ca. 8.

c Cyril. Epiſt. ad Acat. to. 5. Act. Conc. Eph. ca. 8. pa. 834. 835.

he warneth *Acatius* not to give credit to the counterfeit Epiſtle, or forme of union, which the Neſtorians had forged and ſpread abroad in his name. *If any Epiſtle, ſaith he* [d], *be caried about as written by me, tanquam de iis quæ Epheſi acta ſunt, jam dolente, & pœnitentiam agente, contemnatur: as if I did now* (ſince the union) *ſorrow and repent for thoſe things which were done and decreed at Epheſus, let ſuch an Epiſtle be condemned:* Nay the Greeke is more emphaticall, γελάσθω δὲ τοῦτο *ſcorne and deride every ſuch writing.* The like almoſt doth *Cyrill* write to *Dynatus* Biſhop of *Nicopolis*, who upon the Neſtorians ſlanderous reports, ſuſpected as it ſeemeth the very ſame of *Cyrill*, as *Acatius* did. *Cyrill* [e] having declared the certaine truth of theſe matters unto him, ſaith in the end, *It is needfull that you ſhould know the cleare truth of theſe matters*; leſt ſome men who doe vainly [f] and falſly report one thing for another, ſhould trouble any of the brethren: *Perindè acſi nos quæ contra Neſtorij blaſphemias ſcripſimus, retractaremus* [g], as if wee had (upon the union) recalled, revoked or denied, thoſe things which we have written before againſt the blaſphemies of *Neſtorius*.

d *Ibid. pa. 837. a.*

e *Cyrill. Epiſt. ad Dynatum quæ eſt 38. & extat tom. 5. Act. Eph. ca. 16.*

f ψλυαρεῖν.

g ἀνατιθέμην.

17. Beſides theſe indubitate teſtimonies of *Cyrill*, the Neſtorians themſelves doe manifeſt this their calumnie: For although *Iohn* and thoſe Eaſterne Biſhops who in their Councell at *Antioch*, ſubſcribed to that holy profeſſion of faith which was ſent from *Cyrill* unto them, who were by farre the greater part, and who therefore are counted the Eaſterne Church, though theſe I ſay, were as they well deſerved, received into the Catholike Cōmunion, when the *union* was concluded, yet is it moſt untrue which *Vigilius* affirmeth, and takes it for a ground of his errour touching *Ibas*, that *omnes* [h] *orientales Epiſcopi per Paulum Emiſenum ad concordiam redierunt, that all the Eaſterne Biſhops by Paulus Emiſenus returned to the unity and communion of the Church.* They did not all, not *Helladius*, not *Eutherius*, not *Hemerius*, not *Dorotheus*, for whoſe reſtoring to their Sees, (for they were depoſed) *Paulus* did earneſtly labour with *Cyrill*, but not being able to prevaile for them; *manſerunt in eodem ſchiſmate, in quo etiam nunc perſeverant*, they continued in their former ſchiſme, as rent from the Church: and ſo they do now alſo remaine, nor was there in the covenants of peace, any mention of them, as *Cyrill* [i] expreſly affirmeth. But I will onely inſiſt upon two of the principall ſticklers in the Neſtorian hereſie, and who moſt concerne our preſent cauſe: *Theodoret* and *Ibas*.

h *Vig. Conſt. nu. 192*

i *Cyr. Epiſt. ad Dynatum.*

18. *Theodoret* beleeving the reports of his fellow *Neſtorians* that the Catholikes at the time of the *Vnion* had revoked their former doctrines, and conſented to Neſtorianiſme, inſulted over them in a publike oration [k] at *Antioch*, before *Domnus*, in this manner: *Vbi ſunt dicentes, quod Deus eſt qui crucifixus eſt? where are thoſe that ſay that he was God, who was crucified?* God was not crucified, but the man *Ieſus Chriſt*, hee who is of the ſeed of *David*, was crucified: *Chriſt* is the Sonne of *David*, but

k *Quæ extat in conc. 5. Coll. 5. pa. 559.*

but he is the temple of the ſonne of God. *Non jam eſt contentio, Oriens & Ægyptus ſub uno jugo eſt, There is now no contention, the Eaſt, and Ægypt* (that is, all who hold as *Cyrill* did) *are now both under one yoake.* Thus triumphed *Theodoret* over the Catholikes, ſuppoſing (as the Neſtorians ſlanderouſly gave out) that *Cyrill* and all that held with him, that is, all Catholikes, had ſubmitted themſelves, to the yoke of their Neſtorian hereſie, that Chriſt is not God, nor that God was either borne of *Mary*, or ſuffered on the Croſſe. And this being ſpoken by *Theodoret*, after the death of *Cyrill*, which was twelve [l] yeares after the *union* made, doth demonſtrate the obſtinate and malicious hatred of the Neſtorians againſt the truth, who notwithſtanding *Cyrill* had often by words, by writings, teſtified that report, to be nothing elſe, but a ſlanderous untruth, yet in all that time, would not be perſwaded, to deſiſt from that calumny, but ſtill let it paſſe for currant among them, and inſulted, as if *Cyrill* and the Catholikes at the time of the union had condemned their former faith, and conſented to Neſtorianiſme. So hard it is to reclame thoſe who by ſelfe-will are wedded to any hereticall opinion.

l *Nam unio facta an. 432. Cyril. autem obyit an. 444. Bar. in illo ann.*

19. The other is *Ibas*, the Popes owne Catholike doctor, whom, at that very time when hee writ this *Epiſtle* (which was long after the *Vnion* made betwixt *Iohn*, and *Cyrill*) to have embraced no other then this ſlanderous union, or union in Neſtorianiſme, thoſe very words in the later part of his *Epiſtle*, out of which *Vigilius*, and *Baronius* would prove him to bee a Catholike, even thoſe words I ſay, doe ſo fully and manifeſtly demonſtrate, that you will ſay, if not ſweare, that nothing but the love of Neſtorianiſme could ſo farre blind them, as to defend that part of his *Epiſtle*, or undertake by it to prove *Ibas* to be a Catholike. The words of *Ibas* are theſe [m]. *After that* Iohn *had received the Emperors letters, compelling him to make agreement with* Cyrill; *hee ſent the moſt holy Biſhop* Paulus *of* Emiſa, *writing by him a true profeſſion of faith, and denouncing unto him, that if* Cyrill *would conſent to that profeſſion, and anathematize thoſe who ſay that the Godhead did ſuffer* (which opinion the Neſtorians ſlandered *Cyrill*, and all Catholike to hold) *and alſo thoſe who ſay that there is but one nature* (that is, one natural ſubſiſtence or perſon) *of the divinity and humanity in Chriſt; then would he communicate with* Cyrill. *Now it was the will of God, who alwaies taketh care for his Church, which hee hath redeemed with his owne blood, to ſubdue the heart of the Ægyptian* (that is *Cyrill*) *that he preſently conſented to the faith, and embraced it, and anathematized all who beleeved otherwiſe. So they* (Iohn *and* Cyrill) *communicating together, the contention was taken away, peace was made in the Church, and now there is no ſchiſme but peace, as of late there was. And that you may know what words were written, by the moſt holy Archbiſhop* Iohn, *and what anſwer hee received backe from* Cyrill, *I have to this my writing adjoyned*

m *Habentur tum in Conc. Chalc. Act. 10. tum in Con. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 561.*

ned their very Epiſtles, that your Holineſſe reading them may know, and declare to all our Fathers that love peace, that the contention is now ceaſed, and the partition wall is now taken away, and that they (hee meaneth Cyrill *and the Catholikes) who had before ſeditiouſly enveied againſt the living* (Neſtorius) *and the dead* (Theodorus) *are now confounded, making ſatisfaction for their faults, & contraria docentes ſuæ priori doctrinæ, and now teach the contrarie to their former doctrine. For none now dare ſay, that there is one nature* (that is, one naturall ſubſiſtence or perſon) *of the divinity and humanity, but they confeſſe and beleeve, both in the temple, and in him who dwelleth in the temple, who is one Sonne, Ieſus Chriſt. And this I have written to your Sanctitie, out of that great affection which I beare to you, knowing that your holineſſe doth exerciſe it ſelfe, night and day, in the doctrine of God, that you might be profitable unto many.* Thus farre are the words of *Ibas*, written unto *Maris* an hereticke [n] of *Perſia*, and writ not as a private letter, but as an *Encyclicall Epiſtle* to bee ſhewed and notified to all that love peace, that is, according to their *hereticall dialect*, to all that loved Neſtorianiſme in *Perſia*, and in the places adjoyning, to be a comfort and encouragement to them, to perſiſt in their hereſie, to which even *Cyrill* himſelfe, and all Catholikes had upon better advice, at the time of the union with *Iohn*, conſented.

[n] *Ad Marin Perſam, hæreticum. Con. 3. Coll. 8. pa. 587. b.*

20. In which words any who hath though but halfe an eye of a Catholike, cannot chuſe but clearely diſcerne, the very poyſon, and malice of all the hereſies, and practiſes of the Neſtorians, to be condenſate and compact together. Firſt, here is expreſſed their maine hereſie, that Chriſt is not God, as the houſe is not the man who dwelleth in the houſe. Secondly, is ſet downe a notorious ſlander againſt *Cyrill* and the Catholikes, that they at the union made with *Iohn*, did anathematize all who held one naturall ſubſiſtence, or one perſon to be in Chriſt, that is, in effect did accurſe all Catholikes, and the whole Catholike Faith. Thirdly, it is a notable untruth, that *Cyril* made the union with *Iohn* upon this condition, that hee ſhould anathematize all who hold Chriſt to be one perſon, the condition was quite contrarie, to wit, that *Iohn*, and they on his part, ſhould anathematize all who denied Chriſt to be one, or who affirmed him to be two perſons. Fourthly, it is a ſlander, that *Cyrill* writ an Epiſtle to that effect, as if he aſſented to that condition mentioned by *Ibas*. The Epiſtle is teſtified by *Cyrill* himſelfe not to bee his, but a counterfaite writing, forged by the Neſtorians. Fiftly, it is a Calumnie, that *Cyrill* and the reſt who condemned *Neſtorius* and *Theodorus* were ſeditious perſons: it is as much as to ſay, that the holy Epheſine Councell, was a conſpiracie and ſeditious conventicle. Sixtly, it is an unexcuſable ſlander and untruth, that *Cyrill* and they who held with him, that is, the Catholikes, that they were confounded, and repented of their former doctrines, or writ contrarie unto them. Theſe, beſides

divers

divers the like, are the flowers wherewith the latter part of that *Epiſtle* is deckt, even that part which Pope *Vigilius* and *Baronius* doe ſo magnifie, the one defining, the other defending, that by it *Ibas* ought to be judged a Catholike, and his *Epiſtle* received as Catholike: This part above all the reſt, is ſo ſtuffed with hereſies and ſlanders, that I doe conſtantly affirme, that none of all their Romane Alcumiſts can extract or diſtill one dramme of Catholike doctrine, or any goodneſſe out of it. Only Pope *Vigilius*, being, as I have often ſaid, blinded with Neſtorianiſme, and Cardinall *Baronius*, being infatuated with the admiration of their Pontificall *infallible* Chaire, they two by the new found art of Tranſubſtantiating, wherein that ſect excelleth *Iannes* and *Iambres*, and all the inchanters in the world, they by one ſpell or charme of a few words pronounced out of that holy chaire, can turne a ſerpent into a ſtaffe, bread into a living bodie, darkeneſſe into light, an hereticke into a Catholike, yea the very venome and poyſon of all Neſtorianiſme, into moſt wholſome doctrines of the Catholike faith: ſuch, as that none may write, ſpeake, or thinke ought to the contrarie.

21. See ye not now, as I foretold that you ſhould, both the Pope, and the Cardinall, marching under the banner of *Neſtorius*, and like two worthy Generalls, holding up a ſtandard to the Neſtorians, and building in the Romane Church, but very cunningly and artificially, a Capitoll for Neſtorianiſme? They forſooth will not in plaine tearmes ſay that Neſtorianiſme is the Catholike faith, that Chriſt is not God, that the Sonne of *Mary* is not the Sonne of God, that *Cyrill* is an hereticke, and the holy Epheſine Councell hereticall: Fie, theſe are too *Beoticall*, and blunt, they could never have gotten any one to taſt of that cup of Neſtorianiſme, had they dealt ſo plainely, or ſimply rather; *Rome* and *Italy*, are Schooles of better manners, and of more civilitie and ſubtiltie: you muſt learne there to ſpeake hereſie in the *Atticke Dialect*, in ſmooth, plauſible, ſweet and ſugred tearmes; you muſt ſay the *union* which *Ibas* in his *Epiſtle* embraceth is the Catholike union, that *Ibas* by embracing that union was a Catholike, and ought to bee judged a Catholike; that whoſoever embraceth not this union, which the Pope hath defined to be the Catholike communion, cannot be a Catholike: or if you ſpeake more briefly and *Laconically*, you may ſay, the Popes decrees and *Cathedrall* judgements in cauſes of faith are infallible. Say but either of theſe, you ſay as much as either *Theodorus* or *Neſtorius* did, you deny Chriſt to bee God; You condemne the Epheſine Councell, you ſpeake true Neſtorianiſme, but you ſpeake it not after the rude and ruſticke faſhion, but in that pureſt Ciceronian phraſe which is now the refined language of the Romane Church. By approving this union, or the Popes decree in this cauſe of *Ibas*, you drinke up at once all the blaſphemies and hereſies of *Neſtorius*, even the very dregs

of

of Neſtorianiſme; yet your comfort is, though it be ranke poiſon, you ſhall now take it as an antidote, and ſoveraigne potion, ſo cunningly tempered by Pope *Vigilius*, and with ſuch a grace and gravity commended, reached, and brought, even in the golden cup of *Babylon*, by the hands of Cardinall *Baronius* unto you, that it killeth, not onely without any ſenſe of paine, but with a ſweet delight alſo, even in a pleaſing ſlumber and dreame of life; bringing you, as on a bed of downe, unto the pit of death.

22. See here again their *Synoniã* art. Oh how nice & ſcrupulous is *Baronius* in approving, or allowing *Vigilius* to approve the former part of this *Epiſtle* of *Ibas*? The *Epiſtle* [o] was in no other part, but onely in the laſt concerning the union approved: Why? there is nothing at all in the former, no hereſie, or impiety ſet downe in it, which doth not certainly and unavoydably enſue upon the approving of that union in Neſtorianiſme, which *Ibas* embraceth in the latter part. Why then muſt the latter, and not the former be approved? Forſooth in the former part [p] the blaſphemies of the Neſtorians are in too plaine and blunt a manner expreſſed; *Cyrill* is an Apollinarian; The twelve Chapters of *Cirill, omni impietate plena ſunt, are full of all impietie.* The *Epheſine* Councell unjuſtly depoſed *Neſtorius*, and approved the twelve Chapters of *Cyrill*, which are *contraria verae fidei*, and ſuch like. It is not for a Pope or a Cardinall to approve ſuch plaine and perſpicuous hereſies; they might as well ſay, We are heretikes, wee are Neſtorians: which kinde of *Beoticiſme* is farre from the civility of the Romane Court: But in the latter part the hereſies of *Neſtorius* and all his blaſphemies are offered in the ſhew of union with *Cyrill*, and communion with the Church; and comming under the vaunt of that union, as in the wombe of the Trojane horſe, the Pope and the Cardinall may now with honour receive them; the union (and with, or in it all Neſtorianiſme) muſt be brought into the City, the Pope and the Cardinall will themſelves put their hands to this holy worke, *pedibuſque rotarum ſubijciunt lapſus, & ſtupea vincula collo intendunt*, themſelves will drag and hale it with their owne ſhoulders to within the wals: nor is that enough, it muſt be placed in the very Romane Capitoll, in the holy temple, and conſecrated to God, and that the Pope himſelfe will doe by an *Apoſtolicall* and infallible conſtitution: by that immutable decree is this union ſet up as the Catholike union, *Et monſtrum infœlix ſacrata ſiſtitur arce*; this unholy and unhappy union is now embraced, by which all the gates of the City of God are ſet wide open for all hereſies to ruſh in at their pleaſure, and make havocke of the Catholike faith.

o *Bar. an. 553. nu. 192.*

p *Vid. Epiſt. Ibæ lec. cit.*

23. Now it is not unworthy our labour to conſider whether *Vigilius* and *Baronius* did in meere ignorance, or wittingly embrace this union mentioned by *Ibas*, that is in truth, all Neſtorianiſme. And for *Vigilius*, if any will be ſo favourable as to inter

pret

pret all this to have proceeded of ignorance, I will not greatly contend with him. It is as great a crime for their Romane *Apollo*, and as foule a diſgrace to their *infallible* Chaire upon ignorance to decree an hereſie, as to do it upon wilfull obſtinacy; yet to cõfeſſe the truth, I am more than of opinion that *Vigilius* not upon ignorance, but out of a ſetled judgment & affection wch he bare to Neſtorianiſme decreed this union, and with it the doctrines of *Neſtorius* to be embraced: And that which induceth mee ſo to judge, is the great diligence, care, and circumſpection which *Vigilius* uſed to enforme both himſelfe and others in this matter; for beſides that this cauſe was debated, and continually diſcuſſed in the Church for the ſpace of ſix yeares and more, before the Pope publiſhed this his *Apoſtolicall* Conſtitution, (all which time *Vigilius* was a chiefe party in this cauſe) himſelfe in his decree witneſſeth concerning this *third Chapter*, or *Epiſtle* of *Ibas*, that he examined it, *diligenti* p *inveſtigatione*, *by a diligent inquiſition*; yea, that he peruſed his bookes moſt q diligently for this point, and concludeth both of it, and the reſt, that hee decreed theſe things, *cum* r *omni undique cautela atque diligentia*; *with all poſſible care and diligence that could be uſed*: And becauſe, *plus vident oculi quam oculus*, hee added to his owne the judgement of an whole Synod of Biſhops, all of them bending their eyes, wits, & induſtry to find out the truth in this cauſe. Further yet *Vigilius* ſpeaketh in this cauſe of *Ibas* not doubtfully, but in words proceeding from certaine knowledge and reſolute judgment, *diluci-de*, ſ *aperteque reperimus*, *evidenter* t *advertimus*, *apertiſſimum* u *noſcuntur prabuiſſe conſenſum*, *evidenter* x *declaratur*, *in Iba Epiſcopo nihil in confeßione fidei fuiſſe reprehenſum*, *illud* y *indubitanter patet*, *apertiſſima* z *lucet veritate ex verbis Epiſtola*, *conſtat* a *eundem Ibam communicatorem Cyrilli fuiſſe toto vitæ ejus tempore*, *luce clariùs* b *demonſtratur*: All which doe ſhew, that *Vigilius* ſpake out of his ſetled judgement and reſolution, after moſt diligent examination of this cauſe. Now that the whole *Epiſtle*, and, of all parts, that eſpecially where *Ibas* intreateth of the union, that this is full of Neſtorianiſme, is ſo evident, that ſcarce any, though but of a ſhallow judgement, who doth with ordinary diligence peruſe and ponder the ſame, can otherwiſe chuſe than obſerve, and ſee it. Wherefore I cannot thinke but that *Vigilius* both ſaw and knew that part of the *Epiſtle*, above all the reſt, to containe the doctrines of *Neſtorius*, and an approbation of them all, and that by approving the union there mentioned, he approved all the doctrines of the Neſtorians.

p *Vig. Conſt. nu.* 186.
q *Geſta Concily habe. diligentiſſime perquirentes. Ibid.*
r *Ibid. nu.* 208.
ſ *Nu.* 186.
t *Nu.* 190.
u *Ibid.*
x *Nu.* 193.
y *Nu.* 195.
z *Nu.* 196.
a *Nu.* 198.
b *Nu.* 207.

24. But for cardinall *Baronius*, that hee in defending the latter part of this *Epiſtle*, as doth *Vigilius* before him, that in ſtriving ſo earneſtly by it to prove *Ibas* to have beene a catholike, and his *Epiſtle* to be orthodoxall, at leaſt in the latter part, becauſe *Ibas* aſſented to the *union* mentioned therein, that he I ſay did herein wittingly, willingly, and obſtinately labour to maintaine

taine the condemned hereſie of *Neſtorius*: for my owne part I cannot almoſt doubt, nor, as I thinke, will his beſt friends when they have well conſidered of his words: He intreating of this matter touching *Ibas* and his *Epiſtle*, in another place, where this *Conſtitution* of *Vigilius* comes not to the ſcanning, and ſo did not dimne his ſight, ingenuouſly there confeſſeth, that this *Epiſtle* is hereticall, written by a Neſtorian, written of purpoſe to diſgrace *Cyrill*, and the catholikes, as if they at the union had recanted their former doctrines. But let us heare his owne words.

25. He having ſhewed [c] that the union was made in every point according to *Cyrils* minde, and without the condemning of his twelve Chapters, addeth this, *They* [d] *who favoured Neſtorius ſpred abroad a rumour, that Cyrill had in all things conſented unto Iohn, and condemned his former doctrines*: and a little after declaring [e] how the Neſtorians did ſlander *Cyrill*, he ſaith, Beſides others, who tooke part with *Neſtorius*, even *Theodoret* alſo, *ijſdem aggreſſus eſt Cyrillum urgere calumnijs, vexed Cyrill with the ſame ſlanders*, that he had condemned his owne Chapters; and then comming to this *Epiſtle* of *Ibas*, he thus writeth, *Who* [f] *ſo deſireth to ſee further the ſleights of the Neſtorians, let him reade the Epiſtle, wch is ſaid to be the Epiſt. of Ibas unto Maris*, wherin any may ſee the Neſtorian fellow inſulting and triumphing, as if the cauſe had beene adjudged to him, *& jactantem Cyrillum pœnitentem, tandem recantaſſe palinodiam, and vaunting that Cyrill repenting himſelfe of his former doctrines, did now at laſt revoke the ſame, and ſing a new ſong. And this the author of that Epiſtle writ, and ſent abroad as a Circular Epiſtle, to be read throughout the Provinces, pro ſolatio eorum, & ignominia Catholicorum; for the comfort of the Neſtorians, and for the diſgrace of Catholikes*, Thus *Baronius*. Profeſſing as you ſee, that he knew this Epiſtle to be hereticall, and that even in the latter end, which *Vigilius* and himſelfe defendeth as orthodoxall, yea, evē in that very point touching the *union* mentioned in that *Epiſtle*, to be a meere calumnie againſt *Cyrill*, and the Catholikes, as if they, by making the *union*, had conſented to Neſtorianiſme, and renounced the *Epheſine* Councell, and the Catholike faith.

c *Bar. an. 432. nu. 68. abſq; condemnatione ſuorum Capitulorum, cuncta arbitrio Cyrilli geſta ſunt.*
d *An. eod. nu. 69.*
e *Ibid. nu. 70.*
f *Ibid. nu. 71.*

26. Seeing now the Card. knew all this to be true, and yet afterwards for defence of *Vigilius* and his *Conſtitution*, teacheth and maintaineth, that by embracing the *union* mentioned in this *Epiſtle*, *Ibas* was a Catholike, and was for this cauſe by the Councell at *Chalcedon*, and ought by all others to be adjudged a Catholike, is it not evident that the Cardinall wittingly and willingly maintaines hereby the union with the Neſtorians to bee the catholike union, and ſo the doctrines of the Neſtorians to bee the catholike faith? for this *union* mentioned in the *Epiſtle*, is, as the Cardinall profeſſeth, an union in Neſtorianiſme, an union with *Cyrill*, having now renounced the *Epheſine* Councell, and the catholike faith.

27. Onely

27. Onely there is one quirke or ſubtilty in the Cardinals words, which may not without great wrong unto him bee omitted, where he acknowledgeth this *Epiſtle* to be [g] hereticall, & hereticall in this point of the *union*, there he will not [h] have it to be the *Epiſtle* of *Ibas*, for then by it *Ibas* ſhould bee judged a Neſtorian, which would quite overthrow the *Conſtitution* of *Vigilius*: when in the other [i] place he defends, as *Vigilius* decreeth, that *Ibas* by this *Epiſtle*, and by conſenting to this *union* was a Catholike, and ought to bee judged a Catholike; there the *Epiſtle* is truly the *Epiſtle* of *Ibas*, but then conſenting to this *union* is the note of a Catholike: So both this *Epiſtle* is the Epiſtle of *Ibas*, and it is not the *Epiſtle* of *Ibas*; and to conſent to the union herein mentioned, is the note of a Neſtorian heretike; and to conſent to the ſame union, is the note of a good Catholike. Thus doth the Cardinall play, & ſport himſelfe in contradictions, and as the winde blowes and turnes him, ſo doth he turne his note alſo: If the winde blow to *Alexandria*, and turne the Cardinals face towards *Cyrill*, then the union is hereticall, leſt *Cyrill* who condemned it, ſhould bee condemned for an heretike. If the winde blow from *Africke*, and turne the Cardinals face towards *Rome* and Pope *Vigilius*, then the union is Catholike, leſt *Vigilius* approving this union, ſhould not be thought a Catholike. Or becauſe a Cardinall ſo learned, ſo renouned as *Baronius*, may not be thought to contradict himſelfe, or ſpeake amiſſe in either place; let both ſayings be admitted for true, and then it unavoydably followeth; that by the Cardinals divinity, and in his judgment, Neſtorianiſme is the Catholike faith; which aptly and eaſily will accord both his ſayings, for ſo the author of this *Epiſtle* by approving this union ſhall be a perfect Neſtorian, as in the one place is affirmed; and by approving this union ſhall be withall a perfect Catholike, as in the other place is avouched.

28. Beſides this confeſſion of *Baronius*, which is cleare enough, there is yet another meanes to demonſtrate that the Cardinall by defending this latter part of the *Epiſtle* touching the union, did wittingly and wilfully maintaine the condemned hereſie of *Neſtorius*: for the fift generall Councell, approved, as wee have ſhewed, by the judgment of the whole Catholike Church, hath adjudged this very part [k] of the *Epiſtle*, the defence whereof *Baronius* hath undertaken, not onely to bee hereticall, but to bee more full of blaſphemies than any of the reſt; it hath [l] further judicially defined al that defend either this, or any part of that Epiſtle, to be heretikes, and for ſuch it hath anathematized them, yea, all that write [m] either for it, or for them. Now the Cardinall had read the whole fift Councell, as appeareth by that ſummary collection [n] which he hath made of the Acts, and of every Collation thereof; nay, hee had not onely read theſe Acts, but pried earneſtly with a jealous and carping eie, into every corner and ſentence thereof, as you ſhall perceive hereafter; and therefore

g *Videre eſt Neſtorianum hominem, &c. Bar. an. 432. nu. 71.*

h *Non eſſe Ibæ comperta. Ibid.*

i *Vigilius aſſerere voluit ex ed Epiſtolâ Ibam eſſe recipiendum, in qua nimirum ipſe teſtatur ſe amplexũ pacem eccleſiæ, qua recepta, neceſſe fuerit eundem probare Catholicum. Bar. an. 533. nu. 191.*

k *Poſteriora enim inſerta Epiſtolæ, majori impietate plena ſunt, Cyrillum et ſimilia ei ſapientes injuriantia, et omnino impiam ſectam Neſtorij vindicantia. Conc. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 564. a. Scimus et nos hæc ita ſubſequuta eſt, &c. Ibid.*

l *Qui dicit eam rectam eſſe, vel partem ejus. Coll. 8. fa. 587. b.*

m *Eos qui ſcripſerunt vel ſcribunt pro ea. Ibid.*

n *Extat in Annal. Bar an. 553. a. nu. 33. ad 217.*

fore it is doubtleſſe that hee knew the judgement of this fift Councell, concerning all that defend any part of this *Epiſtle*, and ſpecially the latter part, which concernes the *union*. Neither onely did he know that to be the judgement of this fift Councell, but (as himſelfe * expreſly witneſſeth) of all both Popes, and generall Councels which followed it, all of them approving this fift Councell, and the judgement thereof; whence it is cleare, that *Baronius* knew certainly himſelfe by defending this part of the *Epiſtle* touching the *union*, to defend that which by the judgment of the fift Councell, and the whole Catholike Church ever ſince hath beene condemned for hereticall, and the defenders of it anathematized as heretikes: yet ſuch was the Cardinals zeale, and ardent affection to Neſtorianiſme, that againſt the judgement of the whole Church knowne unto him, yea, knowne for this very cauſe to anathematize him, yet he defends the *union* there mentioned, and the latter part of that *Epiſtle*, wherein it is mentioned, that is in truth, all the blaſphemies of *Neſtorius*, choſing rather, by adhering to *Vigilius* and his hereticall decree, to be condemned, and anathematized by the whole Catholike Church for a Neſtorian heretike, than by forſaking the defence of *Vigilius*, and his decree, to condemne this latter part of the *Epiſtle* of *Ibas*, touching the *union*, which containeth in it the very quinteſſence of all Neſtorianiſme.

* *An.* 553. *nu.* 229.

29. I think it is now ſufficiently apparent by that which wee have already ſaid, that the union which *Ibas* in his *Epiſtle* mentioneth and embraceth, and which *Vigilius* firſt, and after him *Baronius* approveth, is not that true union in the Catholike faith, which *Cyrill* made with *Iohn* and other Eaſterne Biſhops; but onely an union in Neſtorianiſme, and in denying the Catholike faith, to which the Neſtorians falſly reported and ſlandered *Cyrill*, with the other Catholikes, to have conſented, and thereby to have condemned and anathematized that truth, which the yeare before they had decreed at *Epheſus*; Yet for the full ſatisfaction of all, and clearing of all doubts which may ariſe, I will adde one thing further which will much more manifeſt both the calumnie of the Neſtorians, and the conſtancy of Saint *Cyrill*, and that is, upon what colour or pretence the Neſtorians raiſed this ſlanderous report, which I am the more deſirous to explane, becauſe the narration of this matter is extreamly confounded, and entangled by *Baronius* and *Binius*, and that, as may be feared, even of ſet purpoſe, that they might either quite diſcourage others (as almoſt they had done my ſelfe) in the ſearch of this truth, or at leaſt miſleade them into ſuch by-paths, that they ſhould not finde the truth in this matter.

30. When *Theodoſius* the religious Emperour had written by *Ariſtolaus* that earneſt letter to *Iohn*, and the other Eaſterne Biſhops, perſwading, yea, commanding them to conſent with *Cyrill*, and embrace the Catholike communion; they upon the Emperours

perors motion ſought indeed to make an union with *Cyrill*, but they laboured to effect it by drawing *Cyrill* unto their bent, and to conſent unto their hereſies. This they firſt attempted by a letter of *Acatius* Biſhop of *Berea*, willing [p] him to write, in all their names unto *Cyrill*, that no unity, or concord could be made, but according to thoſe conditions which themſelves ſhould preſcribe: and the condition preſcribed by them, was that *Cyrill* ſhould [q] aboliſh and condemne all that ever hee had written againſt Neſtorianiſme, and ſo both his twelve Chapters, and the Epheſine decree, and all the like. *Cyrill* anſwered [r] with great confidence: *rem eos poſtulare quæ fieri plane non poſſet, that they required a matter utterly impoſſible*, becauſe what hee had written touching that matter, was rightly written, and in defence of the true faith, and therefore that he could not either condemne, or deny what he had written.

31. When it ſucceeded not this firſt way, they next attempted to effect the *union* by *Paulus* [s] Biſhop of *Emiſa*, whom they ſent to *Alexandria*, to negotiate for them both by words, and by a ſecond letter which they ſent by him. And although they were not in this ſecond ſo violent as in the former of *Acatius*, yet they writ [t] ſome things therein alſo, not fitting, nor allowable; for they reproved the holy Epheſine Councell, as if things had been ſpoken, and done therein amiſſe; What did *Cyrill* anſwer? *Hujuſmodi epiſtolas equidem non admiſi, truly I did not admit or allow of this their ſecond Epiſtle neither*, ſeeing therein they did adde new contumelies, who ſhould have asked pardon for the old. But where as *Paulus* did very earneſtly excuſe the matter, affirming, and that upon his oath alſo, that their purpoſe was not to exaſperate *Cyrill*, but to accord with him, *dilectionis gratia excuſationem admiſi, I in charity was content to admit of this excuſe.* And *Paulus* being very deſirous to effect the *union*, conſented to anathematize *Neſtorius* and his hereſies; to conſent alſo to the depoſing of *Neſtorius*, and the electing of *Maximianus* in his place: which when *Paulus* had performed, and ſubſcribed *ſuo chyrographo, with his owne hand-writing*, (which was all that either the Emperor or *Cyrill* required) *ad ſynaxim recepi, I received him to the communion of the Church.* But when *Paulus* would further have perſwaded *Cyrill*, that ſeeing he was ſent in the name of the reſt, and had ſubſcribed this, *pro omnibus, & tanquam ex communi omnium orientalium perſona, for them all, and as it were in the perſon of them all*: and therefore laboured with *Cyrill*, that this his ſubſcription might ſatisfie for the others alſo, and that he would require no more of them, but be content with their letters which by him they had ſent; *nulla ratione id fieri paſſus ſum*, ſaith *Cyrill*, *I could by no meanes indure that*: I told *Paulus* alſo, that his ſubſcription in condemning *Neſtorius* and his hereſies, *Ipſi ſoli ſufficere, could ſatisfie but only for himſelfe*, but as for the reſt, *Iohn* [u], and they muſt perſonally, and for themſelves ſubſcribe; or elſe they could

[p] *Apud Acatium Beræenſem Epiſcopũ congreſſi, ſcribi ad me curarunt, pacem concordiamq; niſi eo modo quem præſcriberent, fieri non debere, Epiſt. Cyrilli ad Acatium, quæ eſt 29. & ext. tom. 5. Ali. Epheſ. ca. 7. & idem habetur in Epiſt. Cyrilli ad Dynatum tom. eod. ca. 16.*

[q] *Vrgebat ut omnibus quæ adverſus Neſtorium ſcripſimus abolitis & velut inutilibus rejectis, &c. Epiſt. ad Dynat. & ſimilia habentur in Epiſt Cyrill. ad Acat. locis cit.*

[r] *Cyrill. Epiſtola ad Dynat & ad Acat.*

[s] *Miſerunt Alexandriam Paulum Epiſcopum Emiſenum &c. ibid.*

[t] *Attulit quædam parum decore & commode propoſita, ibid.*

[u] *Modis omnibus opus eſſe dixi ut Johannes ſcriptam de his confeſſionem ederet, &c. Cyrill. Epiſt. ad Acatium.*

could not bee received into communion: whereupon *Cyrill* writ an orthodoxall profeſſion [x] to that ſame effect, whereunto *Paulus* had ſubſcribed, and ſent it unto *Iohn*, requiring his perſonall ſubſcription to it. This was the ſumme of all that was done by *Paulus* at his firſt comming.

32. *Paulus* returning to *Antioch*, brought this reſolute anſwer of *Cyrill*, to *Iohn*, and the Biſhops of his Synod. They ſeeing no other meanes to make an union, but onely by conſenting to *Cyrill*; and ſeeing that *Paulus*, whom they put in truſt as their agent, had both himſelfe conſented, and further undertaken that *Iohn* and they ſhould likewiſe conſent unto the ſame which hee had done, did now at length yeeld [y] to all the demands of *Cyrill*: and for an aſſurance of their ſincerity therein, they writ a Synodall [z] and *Encyclicall* Epiſtle unto *Cyrill*, which they likewiſe ſent unto Pope *Sixtus*, to *Maximianus*, and other principall Biſhops, wherein they firſt ſet downe a very ſound, true and orthodoxall confeſſion of their faith, and then teſtifie their willing aſſent and ſubſcription, to the depoſing [b] of *Neſtorius*, and the condemning of his hereſies.

33. This Synodall letter they ſent to *Cyrill* by *Paulus* [c] Biſhop of *Emiſa*, that he might make a finall peace, and union. At whoſe comming to *Alexandria* this ſecond time, and bringing with him this undoubted teſtimony of the orthodoxie of *Iohn*, and the chiefe of the Eaſterne Biſhops, and that they had now conſented to all which either the Emperour, or *Cyrill* required of them, the union was fully concluded on every part, and peace made in the Church: In token whereof *Paulus* preached at *Alexandria*, in the month of December [d], making there before *Cyrill*, and the whole City, ſo orthodoxall a profeſſion of the faith, that the people for joy interrupting him foure or five times, exclamed [e], *Bene veniſti Orthodoxe, O Orthodox Paul thou art welcome to us, Cyrill* is orthodoxall, *Paulus* is orthodoxall: and *Cyrill* for his part writ that learned Epiſtle [f] in congratulation unto *Iohn*, and the reſt which beginneth, *Let the Heavens rejoyce, and let the earth be glad*, publiſhing it as *an hymne of joy and thankſgiving for the union now effected in the Church*, ſinging *Glory unto God, and peace among men*.

34. This is the true narration of the whole proceedings betwixt *Cyrill*, and the Eaſterne Biſhops touching this matter of the union, as they who diligently peruſe the Epiſtles of *Cyril* to *Acatius* Biſhop of *Melitene*, to *Dynatus*, and *Iohn*, and compare therewith the Epiſtle of *Iohn*, and the Synod of *Antioch* ſent to *Cyrill* and *Xiſtus*, will clearly perceive, whence three things may be obſerved: The firſt is the moſt ſhameleſſe dealings of the Neſtorians, who ſlandered *Cyrill* to have at the time of the union conſented in all points unto them, and to their hereſie, and to have condemned his former doctrine, and the Epheſine Councell, wheras the quite contrary was true. He was moſt inflexible

and

x *Niſi chartam qua ſignificavi, ſi Iohannes illi ſubſcripſerit, tum communionem illi reddite. Cyrill. Epiſt. ad Dynat.*

y *Cum Johannes ſubſcripſiſſet, cæteri, qui majore authoritate apud ipſum erant, Cyrill. Epiſt. ad Dynat.*

z *Ea extat inter Epiſt. Cyrilli Epiſt. 27. & in Act. Conc. Epheſ. to. 5. ca. 5.*

a *Miſerunt autem eandem Epiſtolam, quam ad me ſcripſerunt ad Xiſtum & Maximianum, Cyrill. Epiſt. ad Dynat.*

b *Placuit nobis Neſtorium pro depoſito habere, pravaſque illius prophanaſque novitates anathematizare. Epiſt. Synodalis Iohannis Antioch, & Synodi Antioch. to. 5. Act. Epheſ. ca. 5.*

c *Nos Dominum noſtrum Paulum ad ſanctitatem tuam mittendum duximus Epiſt. Ioh. & Synod. Antioch. loco jam citato, & ex charta, quam Dominus meus Paulus nunc attulit evidenter cognoſcimus. Continet enim inculpatam fidei confeſſionem. Cyrill. Epiſt. 28. quæ eſt ad Johannem Antioch. & extat tom. 5. Act. Epheſ. ca. 6.*

d *Nempe 29. menſis Chiath. i. Decembris. to. 6. Act. Epheſ. ca. 13. in tit.*

e *Ibid. to. 6. ca. 13.*

f *Epiſt. Cyrilli 28. quæ extat tom. 5. Act. Epheſ. ca. 6.*

and constant in maintaining the true faith; more inexorable than *Æacus*, or rather, as *Moses* [g] would not consent to *Pharoah*, no, not in the least hoofe, so would not *Cyrill* yeeld one heire-bredth unto them, but brought them to subscribe wholly, and in every point, to that which he desired.

[g] Exod. 10. 26.

35. The second is, the occasion which the Nestorians tooke for their pretended calumnie: They knew that *Iohn* and the Easterne Bishops had written to *Cyrill*, willing him to condemne his owne Chapters; yea, that they had writ so resolutely, that unlesse *Cyrill* did so, they would not consent unto any peace, or union. Thus much was true, as by the letter of *Acatius* Bishop of *Berea* to *Cyrill* is evident: Now they saw that *Cyrill* afterwards, and in that very yeare consented with *Iohn*, and made union with him, whereupon they boasted that *Cyrill* did it upon the condition required by *Iohn* at the first, which was the condemning of his former doctrine; wilfully and maliciously concealing both how *Cyrill* utterly denyed to yeeld unto them, or to that condition required by them; and how at the length *Iohn*, and so many of them as were received into communion, consented wholly unto him, and subscribed to the Catholike faith. All this they quite suppresse; and, to colour the matter, they forged [h] a letter under the name of *Cyrill*, as consenting to condemne his owne doctrine; which no doubt was the same letter that *Ibas* in his *Epistle* inclosed, and sent unto *Maris* the heretike.

[h] *Si qua Epistola à quibusdam circumferatur tanquam à me, de ijs quæ Ephesi acta sunt jam dolente, & pœnitentiâ agente, perscripta, ea quoque contemnatur. Cyrill. Epist. ad Acat. in fine.*

[i] *Ba. an. 432. nu. 54*

[k] *Consultius deliberatur, ratam habendam esse damnationè hæresis Nestorianæ. Ibid.*

36. The third is, how *Baronius* hath perverted the narration of this *union*, and strengthened the calumnie of the Nestorians by his misreporting of the same: But first we must set downe the Cardinals words; *Vpon the Emperours letters* (saith hee [i]) *sent unto Iohn, commanding him, and the rest, to agree with Cyrill; Iohn and the Easterne Bishops met together in a Synod at Antioch, and they agreed to* [k] *ratifie the condemnation of Nestorius, and his heresie, as the Emperour had required them to doe; and so to make union with the Pope, with Cyrill, and with the Catholike Church.* According to this agreement they made a Synodall decree, and Synodall [l] Epistle, containing the condemning of *Nestorius*, with his heresies; and an orthodoxal profession which they sent to Pope *Sixtus*, and other Catholike Bishops, to testifie their communion with them all [m]. This Epistle [n] by the way, is in effect the [o] same which *Paulus* Bishop of *Emisa* brought, at his second comming into *Alexandria*. The Cardinall proceeding, tels us, that this Epistle was sent as common to all, save [p] onely to *Cyrill*; but as for *Cyrill*, against whom they had most bitter enmity, *aliter* [q] *sibi agendum putarunt*; *they would take another course*, and deale after another manner with him; and marke, I pray you, how that was, they would so deale with him, *ut* [r] *ab eo exigerent Catholicæ fidei confessionem, qua, sua Capitula velut erronea condemnaret; so that they would exact of him a Catholike confession, wherein hee should condemne his owne twelve Chapters as erronious*: and when *Cyrill* refused so to doe,

[l] *Iohannes ex Synodo tunc Antiochiæ habita, de damnatione Nestorij, et ejus hæresi, Synodalem dedit Epistolam. Ib.*

[m] *Hactenus Epistola communis omnibus quidem Episcopis Catholicæ fidei, qui Catholicam & ecclesiarum omnium communionem nanciscerentur. Bar. an. eodem nu. 56.*

[n] *Epistola illa extat to. 5. Act. Conc. Eph. ca. 17.*

[o] *Nam in utraque damnatur Nestorius, et illius hæresis, et approbatur Synodus Ephesina, vide, et confer Epistolas.*

[p] *Dedit Epistolam ad Sixtum. Bar. an. 432. nu. 54. quæ erat communis omnibus Episcopis Catholicis. Ibid. nu. 56*

[q] *Ibid. nu. 57.*

[r] *Ibid.*

in the next place they ſend *Paulus* Biſhop of *Emiſa*, as their Legate, unto *Cyrill*, *qui ſi poſſet ab eo quod petitum antea fuerat, extorqueret*; *who ſhould, if by any meanes hee could, wring from Cyrill that which before they required*; (to wit, the condemning of his Chapters;) but if he could not doe that, nor prevaile therein with *Cyrill*, *tunc de damnatione Neſtorij literas ei redderet*; *then they willed Paulus to deliver unto Cyrill their Synodall letters, written by them, containing the condemnation of Neſtorius, and his hereſie.* Thus *Baronius*; and [f] *Binius* traceth him in theſe ſteps.

[f] *Bin. Notis in Cõc. Antioch. tempore Sixti.*

37. In which narration of the Cardinall, beſides many untruths wherewith it is ſtuffed, there are two things, above all the reſt, to be obſerved. The former is, how wiſe and politike the Cardinall doth make *Iohn*, and the whole Synod of *Antioch*, to be in this matter of the union: firſt, they condemne the hereſies of *Neſtorius*, approve the Epheſine Councell, and by ſo doing approve the twelve Chapters of *Cyrill*; they doe this in a Synod, and publiſh their Synodall decree at *Rome*, at *Conſtantinople*, and other places, to ſhew and teſtifie themſelves to bee truly orthodoxall; and when all this is done, they labour earneſtly, with *Cyrill*, to make him condemne his owne twelve Chapters, which is in effect to maintaine Neſtorianiſme; to condemne the Epheſine Councell, (wherein his Chapters were approved) yea, to condemne their owne Synodall decree, by which themſelves, at *Antioch*, had condemned *Neſtorius*, and approved the Chapters of *Cyrill*. Againe, he makes *Iohn*, and his Synod to communicate with *Sixtus*, with *Maximianus*, with all other Catholikes ſave *Cyrill*, and them of his Patriarchſhip; with all the former they will communicate, though they all approved the twelve Chapters of *Cyrill*; with *Cyril* they will not communicate, unleſſe he will condemne the ſame twelve Chapters. If they thought the twelve Chapters to be hereticall, why hold they commmnion with *Sixtus*, *Maximianus*, and others who approved them? nay, why did themſelves approve them? If they thought them orthodoxall, why would they (being themſelves orthodoxall) perſwade, yea, enforce and wring out of *Cyrill* a condemnation of the orthodoxall faith? Beſides, what a worthy peece of policy was this, which the Cardinall doth faſten upon *Iohn*, and all the reſt? he makes them to ſend *Paulus*, a reverend Biſhop, with a letter purpoſely to be delivered to *Cyrill*, which teſtified their Synodall, and willing conſent in approving the twelve Chapters of *Cyrill*, that is, of the Catholike faith, and yet command *Paulus* to urge and wring from *Cyrill*, if he could, a condemnation of thoſe twelve Chapters, that is, of the whole Catholike faith? What deepe diſſemblers and hypocrites doth hee make *Iohn*, *Paul*, and the reſt of thoſe orthodoxall Biſhops? Laſtly, of what faith or religion, doe you thinke, muſt *Iohn*, *Paul*, and the reſt be, by the Cardinals narration. By their Synodall ſentence, and holy confeſſion therein, they appove the twelve Chapters

of

of *Cyrill*, and so are perfect Catholikes; againe, by their urging of *Cyrill* to condemne his twelve Chapters, they are perfect Nestorians, for the condemning of them, is the defending of all the Nestorian heresies; so, by the Cardinals divinity, they are at the selfe same time, both perfect Nestorians, and perfect Catholikes; which can no way be effected, but by admitting the Cardinals old position, which he learned of *Vigilius*, that perfect Nestorianisme is the perfect Catholike faith.

38. Into such labyrinths doth the Cardinals foule misreporting of this matter leade, and even draw a man; whereas the truth, as, by that which formerly hath beene declared, is evident, that *Iohn*, and the rest of the Synod, when they vrged *Cyrill* to condemne his Chapters, had not made that Synodall decree for condemning of *Nestorius*; & when they had once made that decree, they never, either by word or writing, urged *Cyrill* to condemne those Chapters: Before they made that decree, and condemned *Nestorius*, they were hereticall, and held communion neither with *Cyrill*, nor *Sixtus*, nor any other Catholikes: After they had made that decree, and condemned *Nestorius* with his heresies, they were orthodoxall, & communicated no lesse with *Cyrill*, thã with *Sixtus*, or any other Catholike; nay, they cõmunicated first of all with *Cyrill*, & then with all other Catholikes.

39. The other point to bee observed out of the Cardinalls words, is, that by his narration *Cyrill* did indeed, as *Ibas* and the Nestorians slandered him, renounce & reject the Catholike faith, for the Cardinall makes *Paulus* of *Emisa* but to goe once to *Alexandria* about the union, or if any can finde in the Cardinall a second journey thither, yet by his narratiõ, the Synodall Epistle of *Iohn*, and the rest, wherein they condemne *Nestorius*, and set downe an orthodoxall profession, that Epistle was sent by *Paulus* at the first time, for he had withall in charge to urge *Cyrill* to condemne his twelve Chapters, which at his last going had beene absurd and incongruous. So then the Epistle which *Paulus*, at his first going to *Cyrill* brought with him, was the orthodoxall Epistle of *Iohn*, and the Synod. Now it is certaine by the expresse words of *Cyrill*, that the letter which *Iohn* and the rest, sent by *Paulus* at his first going, was rejected by *Cyrill*, for he saith of that Epistle, *hujusmodi epistolas non acceptavi*, *I did not accept this Epistle sent by* Paul: and the Cardinall [t] citing those words of *Cyrill verbatim*, and making some prettie collection out of them, could not be ignorant hereof. Seing then by the Cardinalls narration, the Epistle which *Paulus* brought at his first comming, was orthodoxall, and seeing it is certaine that *Cyrill* rejected that Epistle, which *Paulus* at his first comming brought from *Iohn*, it inevitably followeth, upon the Cardinalls narration, that *Cyrill* indeed rejected an orthodoxall and Catholike profession, containing the condemnation of *Nestorius*, and his heresies, and therefore that *Cyrill* renounced

[t] *Bar. an. 432. nu. 66.*

his former Catholike doctrine, & conſented to Neſtorianiſme, which is the ſame calumnie wherewith *Ibas* in his impious *Epiſtle*, ſlandereth *Cyrill*. And although *Baronius* doe in words deny this, as I know hee doth, yet conſidering the deepe projects which the Cardinall hath, it may bee feared, that he meant by this meanes, cunningly, and cloſely, to lay a foundation to uphold that union, in which *Ibas* in his Epiſtle rejoyceth, and which *Vigilius* and the Cardinall himſelfe approve for Catholike, or if the Cardinall intended not this, yet I am ſure that hee hath then unwittingly deviſed, ſuch a notable ground, to maintaine that ſlander, which *Ibas* imputeth to *Cyrill*, that at the time of the union he rejected his former doctrines, as that neither *Ibas* himſelfe, nor any of the old Neſtorians could poſſibly have forged a more faire and colourable pretence for the ſame.

40. My concluſion now of this their former reaſon, for defence of the impious *Epiſtle* of *Ibas*; drawne from the *union* mentioned therein, is this: Seeing that *union* mentioned and approved by *Ibas* in the later part of his *Epiſtle*, is no other but the *union* in Neſtorianiſme, unto which hee malitiouſly ſlandereth *Cyrill* to have conſented: and ſeeing Pope *Vigilius*, and Cardinall *Baronius* not onely approve as Catholike, the union there mentioned by *Ibas*, but prove by it and conſenting to it, both *Ibas* himſelfe to bee a Catholike, and his *Epiſtle*, in that part at leaſt, to be orthodoxall, it hence cleerely enſueth, that *Vigilius* by his *Apoſtolicall* ſentence defineth, and *Baronius* by name (as alſo all who maintaine the Popes *Cathedrall* ſentence in cauſes of faith to bee *infallible*) *doe all defend Neſtorianiſme to be the Catholike union, and ſo Neſtorianiſme to bee the Catholike faith:* which whoſoever affirmes, are by the judgement not onely of the fift, but the fourth and third generall Councells, *convicted, condemned*, and *anathematized heretickes*.

CHAP. XII.

That Vigilius *and* Baronius *in their later reaſon for defence of the* Epiſtle *of* Ibas, *taken from the words of* Ibas, *wherein hee confeſſeth* two natures and one perſon in Chriſt, *doe maintaine the hereſies of* Neſtorius.

1. 
He other reaſon whereby they labour to defend this impious *Epiſtle*, and with no leſſe fraud then they did in the former, is taken from the very confeſſion of *Ibas*, ſet downe in his *Epiſtle*, wherein hee acknowledgeth Chriſt to have *two natures, and to bee one perſon*. His words to *Maris* the hereticke are theſe, neare the beginning of his *Epiſtle* [a]. *Cyrill* hath written twelve Chapters which

a *In Cont. Chalc. Act.* 10.

which I thinke your holineſſe knoweth, wherein he teacheth, *quia una eſt natura divinitatis & humanitatis, that there is one nature of the divinitie, and humanitie in Chriſt*, theſe things are full of all impiety; and giving a reaſon hereof, he addeth, for the Church ſaith thus, as it hath beene taught from the beginning, and confirmed therein by the doctrine of the moſt bleſſed Fathers; *Duæ natura, una virtus, una perſona, quod eſt unus filius, Dominus noſter Ieſus Chriſtus, Two natures, one power, one perſon, which is one Sonne our Lord Ieſus Chriſt:* Thus *Ibas*: which words ſeeme to be ſo true, ſo orthodoxall and Catholike, that *Vigilius* and *Baronius*, might either be themſelves hereby deceived, or, which I rather thinke, judge them, as they are indeed, a moſt colourable pretence to deceive others, & lead them into Neſtorianiſme: for no Catholike can poſſibly in fairer tearmes, or better for ſhew of words, expreſſe againſt *Neſtorius* the true doctrine of the Catholike faith, then to ſay that there are two natures in Chriſt, and yet but one perſon. This ſeeing *Ibas* profeſſeth in his *Epiſtle*, and withall accurſeth [b] thoſe who deny two natures in Chriſt, ſure none can thinke but this was a fit text for *Vigilius* and *Baronius*, by it to commend this impious *Epiſtle* as orthodoxall & Catholike, wherein ſo Catholike a confeſſion ſeemeth to bee made. But let us ſee how the Pope and the Cardinall deſcant on theſe words.

b *Denuncians ei ut anathematizaret eos qui dicunt quia una eſt natura divinitatis et humanitatis. Ibas in eadem Epiſt.*

2. *Baronius* ſaith not much, but yet hee ſpeakes plainely of this matter; The fathers at *Chalcedon*, ſaith he [c], out of this *Epiſtle* of *Ibas*, gathered *Ibas* then (when he writ it) to be a Catholike, *utpote quod ex eadem epiſtola demonſtratur ipſe, becauſe by this very Epiſtle* Ibas *was demonſtrated*, both to have held communion with *Cyrill, execratuſque eſſe unam naturam in Chriſto confitentes, confeſſus vero eſſe, naturas duas unam* [d] *[perſonam] efficere, Dominum noſtrum Ieſum Chriſtum*; and alſo he was demonſtrated by this Epiſtle, *to have accurſed thoſe who confeſſe one onely nature in Chriſt, and to have confeſſed the two natures, to make one perſon, and Lord Ieſus Chriſt*. So *Baronius*: teaching not only that profeſſion which *Ibas* makes in his Epiſtle, *of two natures, and one perſon*, to be Catholike, but that *Ibas* by that very confeſſion is proved, nay demonſtrated to be a Catholike.

c Bar. an. 448. nu. 75.

d *Vox [perſonam] vitio Typographi deeſt apud Baron. ſed ex Conſtructione Gammatica, et ipſo ſenſu, neceſſariò addendam liquet.*

3. *Vigilius* handles this matter farre more largely, but very obſcurely & myſtically, as being indeed ſo miſerably intangled in the birdlime of Neſtorianiſme, that hee know not poſſibly how to unfold himſelfe. I muſt firſt of all ſet downe his words, though they be many, and becauſe they are very obſcure, they will require more attentive, and ſerious ponderation; *Theſe things*, ſaith he [e], *which in the Epiſtle of* Ibas, *are injuriouſly ſpoken againſt* Cyrill *by a miſunderſtanding of* Cyrills *ſayings; the Fathers at* Chalcedon, *when they pronounced the Epiſtle to be orthodoxall, did not receive*; for the venerable Biſhop (*Ibas*) himſelfe by changing, refuted thoſe, when he had gotten better underſtanding of

e *Vig. Conſt. nu. 192.*

of thoſe Chapters which *Eunomius* in his interloquution doth
[f] *Ibid. nu. 193.* moſt evidently declare. And [f] the interloquution of *Iuvenalis* doth ſignifie the ſame, who therefore decreed that *Ibas* ſhould receive his Biſhopricke, as holding the orthodoxall profeſſion of faith, becauſe he devoutly ranne, to embrace the communion with *Cyrill*, after that *Cyrill* had explaned his Chapters, and *Ibas* had underſtood them otherwiſe then before he did, though he had carped at *Cyrill*, when hee miſunderſtood thoſe Chapters, for thus ſaid *Iuvenalis*; *The holy Scripture commandeth that hee who is converted ſhould be received, for which cauſe we receive ſuch as returne from heretickes; wherefore I decree that the reverend* Ibas *ſhould obtaine favour and receive his Biſhopricke, both becauſe he is an old man, and becauſe he is a Catholike.* So *Iuvenalis*: By which this is underſtood: If wee receive ſuch as returne from heretikes, how ſhould we not receive *Ibas* who is a Catholike? whom it is manifeſt to be a Catholike, ſeeing hee is now converted, from that underſtanding of *Cyrills* Chapters, whereby hee was deceived, who while hee doubted of the underſtanding of thoſe Chapters, did ſeem to ſpeak againſt *Cyrill*: for never would *Iuvenalis* ſay that *Ibas* were a Catholike, unleſſe he had proved by the words of this *Epiſtle* his confeſſion to bee orthodoxall. And that the Interloquutions of *Iuvenalis* and *Eunomius* doe agree, the words of *Eunomius* doe ſhew, which are theſe; In what things *Ibas* ſeemed to blame *Cyrill*, by ſpeaking ill; hee hath refuted all thoſe things which he blamed, by making a right confeſſion at the laſt. By which words of *Eunomius* it is evidently declared, that in the confeſſion of faith, made by *Ibas*, nothing was reproved, ſeeing it is manifeſt, that his faith was praiſed; and that *Ibas* hath refuted that, which by miſunderſtanding *Cyrill*, hee had thought amiſſe of him.

[g] *Ibid. nu. 194.* 4. For [g] the ſame venerable *Ibas*, by the precedent Acts, (as the judgement of *Photius* and *Euſtathius* doth ſhew) is moſt manifeſtly declared to receive and embrace all things which were done in the firſt Epheſine Synod, and judge them equall to the Nicene decrees, and to put no difference betwixt thoſe and theſe at *Epheſus*: and *Euſtathius* is ſhewed very much to commend the ſanctity of *Ibas*, for that he was ſo ready and willing to cure thoſe, who, either by ſuſpition, or any other way did hurt the opinion of his learning: For after that *Cyrill* had explaned his twelve Chapters, and the meaning which *Cyrill* had in them was declared unto *Ibas*, after that, *Ibas* profeſſed himſelfe, with all the Eaſterne Biſhops, to have eſteemed *Cyrill* a Catholike, and to have remained, even unto his end, in the communion with him; whence it is cleare, that *Ibas*, both before he underſtood the twelve Chapters of *Cyrill*, and when hee ſuſpected *one* (onely) *nature of Chriſt* to be taught and maintained by them, did then in an orthodoxal ſenſe reject that which he thought to be ſpoken amiſſe in thoſe Chapters; and alſo after the explanation thereof,

did in an orthodoxall ſenſe reverently embrace thoſe things which he knew to be rightly ſpoken in thoſe Chapters.

5. Further, [h] it doth without all doubt appeare to the minds of all the faithfull, that *Dioſcorus* with *Eutiches*, did offer more wrong in the ſecond Epheſine Synod, than *Ibas*, to *Cyrill* and the firſt Epheſine Councell, by underſtanding *Cyrils* Chapters in an hereticall ſenſe, beleeving *Cyrill* to teach by his twelve Chapters *one* (onely) *nature in our Lord Ieſus Chriſt*; and for this cauſe did *Dioſcorus* condemne ſome of the Eaſterne Biſhops, who would not acknowledge *one* (only) *nature in Chriſt*; among whom he condemned as an heretike, and depoſed *Ibas* from his Biſhopricke, ſpecially for this very confeſſion of his faith, wherein hee moſt plainly profeſſeth *two natures, one power, one perſon, which is one Sonne, our Lord Ieſus Chriſt*: and *Dioſcorus* reſtored *Eutiches*, as a Catholike, for the confeſſion of *one* (onely) *nature in Chriſt*, condemning alſo *Flavianus*, of bleſſed memory, for the ſame doctrine of holding *two natures*: And *Dioſcorus* and *Eutiches* are found much more to indeavour to overthrow the firſt Epheſine Synod, while they defēd it under the ſhew of an execrable ſenſe, (*of one nature*) and to ſlander *Cyrill* more while they praiſe him, than did *Ibas*, when, by the errour and miſconceiving of *Cyrils* meaning, he diſpraiſed him; for ſeeing their praiſe and diſpraiſe doe tend unto the ſame thing, *Dioſcorus* and *Eutiches*, who condemned *Cyrill*, are found to have commended him with an hereticall ſpirit, or in an hereticall ſenſe, and therfore were they condemned in the Councell at *Chalcedon*; but *Ibas*, who at the firſt diſpraiſed *Cyrils* Chapters, thinking *one* (onely) *nature* to bee taught by them; and who, after the ſenſe and meaning of them was declared unto him, did profeſſe himſelfe, with the Eaſterne Biſhops, to communicate with *Cyrill*, was judged by the ſame Councell of *Chalcedon* to have continued in the right faith. Thus farre are the words of *Vigilius*, and ſo much of his Conſtitution as concernes this profeſſion made by *Ibas*, of *two natures and one perſon in Chriſt*.

[h] *Ibid. nu.* 195.

6. Words like the Oracles of *Apollo*, ful of thick darknes, & hidde myſteries. Nor muſt you here expect any light at al from *Binius*; was wiſe enough to decline theſe rocks in the *Epiſt.* of *Ibas*, both that of the *union* with *Cyril*, this & of his cōfeſſing *two natures and one perſon*; at wch fearing to make ſhipwracke of faith, as *Vigilius* had done before, he thought it to be far the ſafeſt courſe at one ſtroke to wipe away and ſpunge out thoſe whole paſſages both out of the Popes *Conſtitution*, and his owne Tomes of Councels: beſt to have them ſmothered in ſilence, or buried in eternall oblivion. Add yet, to ſay truth, had *Binius* uſed all his art in this point, that alas would but have helped a little; he, poore lambe, is not able of himſelfe to wade, no not through ſhallow places, it would require an Elephant to ſwimme through ſuch a deepe: All his light is but borrowed of others, ſpecially from *Baronius*; where

where *Baronius* is ſilent, he is more mute than a fiſh: yea, and when ſome of the Cardinals beames doe happen to colluſtrate his notes, yet even there they loſe a great part of that vigour which they have in the Cardinals Phœbean lampe.

7. The only man in the world fit to make a full and juſt commentary on this text of *Vigilius*, had beene *Baronius* himſelfe: He by his long acquaintance with Popes, and Court of *Rome*, by his continuall rifling of the Vaticane Manuſcripts, and anatomiſing ſo many Pontificall decrees, had quicke ſenſe of the Popes pulſe, he knew every ſtring and ſtraine in their breaſts. But ſo unhappily it falls out, that the Cardinall himſelfe durſt not touch this ſoare; he paſſeth it over, nay, rather ſhuffles it from him with deepe ſilence; wote you why? you may bee ſure hee knew there was a padde in this ſtraw, which had the Cardinall uncovered, his owne friends could not have indured the lothſome ſent of the Pontificall *Conſtitution*, but for very ſhame would have ſwept it out of the Church of God. Now becauſe it were great pitty that ſo many myſteries as lye hid in this part of the Popes decree ſhould be unknowne to the world, and becauſe the very explication of the Popes words, is a full conviction of his hereſie, for want of a better, I will lend them my beſt endeavours to ſupply the defect of the Cardinals Commentary in this point: And although all that I can ſay is, *nihil ad Parmenonis ſuem*, nothing to that which you ſhould have applauded, *ſi ipſam belluam audiſſetis*, if the Popes commentator had beene himſelfe pleaſed to write hereof; yet truly, by long contemplation of the Popes workes, and induſtrious obſerving the Cardinals *artificium* in explaning the like decrees, I well hope that I ſhal be able *dolare*, and after a rude faſhion to rough-hew a peece of a commentary at this time; onely not being trained up in their Romane Schooles, where they learne to ſpeake ſilken and ſugered words of their Popes, and ſow the ſofteſt Pillowes nnder their elbowes; I muſt crave pardon, if according to the Macedoniã rudeneſſe of our dialect I call a ſpade, a ſpade, a ſlander, a ſlander; and hereſie, hereſie, though it happen to be found even in his Holineſſe himſelfe, and in his Pontificall and *Cathedrall* decree: In hope of which pardon (ſpecially ſince the fault is ſo veniall) I will now addreſſe my ſelfe to an unaccuſtomed taske of making a Commentary upon the Popes writings.

8. The ſcope and purpoſe of *Vigilius* in this whole paſſage, is, to prove not onely *Ibas* himſelfe, but his faith and profeſſion alſo to have beene Catholike, not onely when he writ this *Epiſtle*, but ever ſince *Cyrill* explaned his Chapters, and *Ibas* underſtood the ſame, which was before this *Epiſtle* was writ. And this appeares by the very words of *Vigilius*, who [i] ſaith, that after *Cyrils* Chapters were explaned, and underſtood by *Ibas*, *in communionem ejus devotè concurrerit; he ranne, and haſtened with devotion to embrace the communion with Cyrill*; and having once embraced

[i] *Vig. nu. 193.*

it,

it, *in* [k] *communione ipsius usque ad exitum permansisse; that he continued in the same communion with Cyrill, even to the end of his life*: and as he was then a Catholike, so in this Epistle, which was writ after *Cyrils* explanation understood by him, hee expressed that Catholike faith and profession, seeing [l] *Iuvenalis, ex verbis Epistolæ, ejus confessionem fidei orthodoxam comprobavit; proved the cõfession of Ibas to be orthodoxall by the very words of this Epistle.* This is the purpose then of my author, to shew both *Ibas* and his confession of faith, when he writ this *Epistle*, to have beene Catholike: To prove this he useth three principal reasons, the first is drawne from the explanation of *Cyrils* Chapters, which *Ibas* devoutly embraced, and this hee harps upon almost in every part of his text, as you may easily see. The second is taken from his approbation of the holy *Ephesine* Councel before *Photius* and *Eustathius*, in these words, For the same venerable *Ibas*, &c. The third is drawne from the very profession it selfe, and words thereof set downe in the *Epistle* of *Ibas*, where he confesseth *two natures, and one person*; and though there be a touch and taste of this throughout the whole text, yet is it specially and more expresly set downe in those words, Further, it doth without all doubt appeare, &c. I must be inforced, for more perspicuities sake, to invert the order of mine author, and begin with the exposition of his third reason, because, if that be well understood, it will serve for a torch to direct us in both the other.

k *Ibid nu.* 194.

l *Ibid. nu.* 193.

9. In his third reason the Pope both affirmes, and by divers meanes proves that confession of *Ibas*, which in his *Epistle* hee makes to bee orthodoxall, and before wee handle his proofes hereof we must diligently consider the position it selfe, or confession made by *Ibas*: *Ibas* his confession in his *Epistle* is, that there are *two natures, and one person in Christ*: *This confession in his Epistle*, saith *Vigilius* [m], *is orthodoxall, and for this was Ibas unjustly condemned by Dioscorus, but justly commended by the Conncell at Chalcedon.* I must set an unpleasant, but a very true and certaine glosse upon these words, Both *Ibas*, and *Vigilius* commending him, and *Baronius* defending *Vigilius* herein, doe all Nestorianize, or, to speake more plainely, *Ibas* by that confession in his *Epistle* teacheth, *Vigilius* by his *Cathedrall* decree confirmeth, *Baronius* gnatonically applaudeth, and they all three conspire in defending the condemned heresie of *Nestorius*.

m Et ob hoc aliquos Orientales Episcopos, qui unius naturæ prædicationem voluerunt suscipere Dioscorus condemnavit, inter quos et Ibam, propter hanc specialiter fidei ejus professionem, qua duas naturas, unam virtutem, unam personam apertissimè confitetur, hæreticum condemnavit. *Vig. nu.* 195.

10. For the full manifestation whereof it must bee observed, that the Nestorians, the more plausibly to convey their heresie, wherein they *denyed Christ the sonne of Mary to be God*, used the very same words altogether which Catholikes did. As Catholikes said that there are *two natures in Christ*, the divinity, and the humanity, so said the Nestorians also: As Catholikes confessed *Christ to be our Lord*, so confessed the Nestorians likewise. In words they both agreed and said the same, but in the sense and meaning of those words they were quite contrary.

11. When

11. When Catholikes ſaid, that there are *two natures in Chriſt*, they meant truly & orthodoxally, that the divinity & humanity in Chriſt were differēt in eſſence and ſubſtance, & yet they both made but one *hypoſtaſis*, that is, but *one*, and not *two ſubſiſtent perſons*: But when the Neſtorians ſaid, that there are *two natures in Chriſt*, they meant that either nature made a ſeverall and *diſtinct perſon* by it ſelfe, and ſo they made *Chriſt to be two diſtinct perſons*, each ſubſiſting by it ſelfe, *two Sonnes*, *two Chriſts*, that is, in truth, *no Chriſt*, *no Saviour at all*; for a Saviour he cannot bee, unleſſe the ſelfe ſame perſon which is man be God alſo.

12. Againe, when Catholikes ſaid, that *Chriſt is one perſon*, they meant truly and orthodoxally, that both natures together make but one perſonall ſubſiſtence, as the humane ſoule and body make but one perſon, or one man: but when the Neſtorians ſaid, that *Chriſt was one perſon*, they meant not of that unity which is by naturall or perſonall ſubſiſtence, but *of unity in affection*, *of unity by conſent and liking*, *of unity by cohabitation*; the perſon of the Sonne of God, ſo affecting and liking the ſonne of *Marie*, that it inhabited and dwelt therein, as in a holy temple or houſe; but yet, as neither the houſe is the inhabitant, nor the inhabitant the houſe; ſo neither was God (by their doctrine) *the ſonne of Mary*, *or man*; *nor yet was that man which was the ſonne of Mary*, *God*; but onely the houſe or temple of God.

13. When Catholikes called Ieſus Chriſt *our Lord*, they meant truly and orthodoxally, that the man Ieſus Chriſt, who tooke fleſh of the Virgin *Mary*, is in truth very God, the Godhead being hypoſtatically united unto the manhood, and both of them making but one perſon, who is both God and man: but the Neſtoriās in calling Ieſus Chriſt *our Lord*, meant not that the man Chriſt was truly & perſonally God or Lord, but that he was God, and the Lord, onely by having God and the Lord inhabiting in him, and united, not perſonally, but onely affectually unto him; wherupon it followed, that they in adoring Chriſt, & giving divine honours unto him, were indeed εἰδωλολατραι; for they gave the honour proper onely to God, unto that perſon, or that mā, which, according to their doctrine, they held not to be God.

14. And, which of all may ſeeme moſt ſtrange; whereas Catholikes not onely profeſſed the Virgin *Mary to bee the Mother of God*, but under thoſe very tearmes, and by that forme of words, as being moſt eaſie and perſpicuous, contradicted & condemned all the hereſies of *Neſtorius*, which were all by conſequent included in their denying *Mary* to be Θεοτοκος, the Mother of God; The Neſtorians, to avoid the hatred of this ſpeech, if they ſhould deny it, and more plauſibly to convay their hereſie, ſaid, and in words profeſſed even this alſo, that *Mary was the Mother of God*; but they meant not thereby, as Catholikes did, that Chriſt, who tooke fleſh of the Virgin *Mary*, was the ſame perſon or one perſonall ſubſiſtence with the Sonne of God; or, that God was incarnate,

incarnate, and assumed the manhood to make one person with the Godhead, but all that they meant was, that the Son of God, was onely by affection, and love united unto the sonne of *Marie*, being already perfect man in the wombe of his mother, and that God was borne of her, not by assuming flesh unto him, but by inhabiting that man who tooke flesh of her. Thus in shew of words the Nestorians seemed to bee Catholikes, and to say the same with Catholikes, but their sense and meaning in those words was most hereticall, and therefore indeed and in truth themselves notwithstanding all these speeches, were heretikes.

15. For the full and ample proofe of all these, I must referre my selfe to another Treatise, if it ever happen to see the light: wherein I have at large handled this point, and proved another of their Popes somewhat more ancient then *Vigilius*, I meane *Hormisda*, to have beene as deepe in the heresie of *Nestorius*, and to have as firmly by his Cathedrall and Apostolicall sentence confirmed the same, as *Vigilius* himselfe hath done, who as I thinke, by the example and authority of his predecessor was the more emboldned to plead for Nestorianisme, it being of all heresies which ever sprung up in the Church, most full of all sophisticall subtilties, and colourable pretences of wit, was most fit of all the rest, to be commended by such as under the shew of learning, and truth, meant to defend and uphold heresie. But for this time I will now alleage onely a few evident testimonies, to declare the truth of that concurrence in words, and difference in sense, betweene Catholikes and Nestorians, which even now I mentioned.

16. *Nestorius* in his Epistle [n] to *Alexander* signifying that the *two natures* in Christ are also *two persons*, saith thus; *Non duas personas unam personam facimus, we doe not make two persons, one person*; but by this one name of Christ, we signifie *two natures* (to wit, making *two persons*.) And to shew how these two persons are called by them one person; *thou mayst*, saith he [o], *call him that was borne of Mary, by the name of the Sonne of God*; for the Virgin which bare Christ, *filium Dei genuit, bare the Sonne of God*, but because the Sonne according to the Natures is double, *non genuit quidem* [p] *filium Dei, she did not truly beare the Son of God* (as taking flesh from her) but she bare the man or humane nature, *quæ propter filium adjunctum, filij quoque appellatione afficitur, which is called the Sonne of God, because the Sonne God is united and joyned unto him*: and in another place [q], He that was framed in the wombe, and laid in the grave, is not of himselfe God: *at quia Deus in homine assumpto existit, but because God is in the man whom hee assumes unto him*, the man assumed is called God, because hee is assumed of God. So *Nestorius*, plainly calling Christ, *God*, and the *Son of God*, and *Marie, the mother of God*, and yet denying *God and man to be one person*; *but the person of God to assume a perfect man, or the person of Man.*

n Extat in Conc. 5 Coll. 6. pa 575. b.

o Nestorij verba citata ibidem. pa. 576. a. & in Actis Conc. Ephes. to. 2. ca. 8. pa. 747. a.

p Negat Nestorius Mariam genuisse filium, ita ut ex ipsa carnem sumpserit, affirmat genuisse, ita ut ex ipsa prodierit. Hoc declarant Nestorij verba apud Cyrillum citata in Epist. ad Acatium. to. 3. Act. Ephes. ca. 7 vbi ita ait Nestorius; Deum ex Christipara virgine prodijsse ex divina scriptura edoctus sum, at verò Deum ex ipsa genitum esse (eo quo dixi sensu) id nusquam edoctus sum.

q Non per se & secundum se Deus est, quod in utero formatum est, non per se & secundum se Deus est, quod spiritus Sancti operâ effectum est: non per se & secundum se Deus est, quod in monumento conditum est. At quia Deus in homine assumpto extitit, assumptus assumenti conjunctus, propter assumentum Deus appellatur. verba Nestorij citata in Act. Conc. Ephes. to. 2. ca. 8. pa. 748. a.

17. *Theodorus* the maſter of *Neſtorius* declares the ſame; *In ipſo* [r] *plaſmato Deus verbum factus eſt. The Word or Sonne of God was united to the man Chriſt*, being framed and formed, ſhewing plainly that Chriſt was firſt made a perfect man, and perſon, and that then the Sonne of God as another perſon was united unto him. And ſhewing that the unity of the *two natures* is not *perſonall*, but onely *affectuall*; hee compares the unity which is betwixt the Godhead, and the manhood in Chriſt, to that unitie which is betwixt man and wife, who though they bee called one, yet are they in naturall ſubſiſtence two diſtinct perſons. Even ſo ſaith he [r] in Chriſt, *non nocet naturarum differentiæ unitas perſonæ, the unity of perſon doth not take away the diſtinction of the natures.* And the two natures joyned together, *unam perſonam dicimus, we call one perſon:* which unity not to be perſonall no more then it is in man and wife, but affectuall, hee immediately explaneth, expreſly affirming either nature in Chriſt, to be a perfect and diſtinct perſon, or perſonall ſubſiſtence by it ſelfe, ſaying, for when we diſcerne or teach two natures, *perfectam naturam verbi Dei dicimus & perfectam perſonam, perfectam autem & hominis naturam & perſonam ſimiliter: we affirme both the perfect nature, and the perfect perſon of the Sonne of God, and alſo the perfect nature, and perfect perſon of man to be in Chriſt:* but when we look at the conjunction of theſe (natures) *unam perſonam tunc dicimus, then wee call them one perſon*, (to wit one by *affectuall*, but not by *naturall* and *perſonall unity*, for he ſaid plainly before, that they were two perfect diſtinct perſons.) Thus *Theodorus*.

r Theodori verba citata in Conc. 5. Coll. 4. pa. 528. a.

[r] Coll. eadem. pa. 532. a. & Coll. 6. pa. 576. a.

18. This is to have beene the very true meaning of the Neſtorians, *Iuſtinian* in his Edict manifeſtly declareth, writing thus and moſt divinely; *In* [t] *that the Apoſtle ſaith of the Sonne of God, that he tooke the forme of a ſervant, he ſheweth that the Word was united to the Nature of Man: but not to any ſubſiſtence or perſon:* for he doth not ſay; he tooke him, who was in the forme of a ſervant, leaſt he ſhould imply thereby, that the Word was united unto the man being formerly formed, as impious *Theodorus* and *Neſtorius* did blaſpheme: *affectualem dicentes unitatem, teaching an affectuall* (and no perſonall) *unitie* betwixt them. The fift Councell after moſt exact ſifting of this matter doth witnes the ſame, writing thus; *Theodorus* [u] and *Neſtorius teaching two perſons, two Chriſts, two ſonnes, would hide their impietie by calling them two natures, and one ſonne.* And a little after, *Theodorus affectualem unitatem dicens, naturas pro perſonis & ſubſiſtentijs accipit. Theodorus teaching an affectuall union* (onely) *to bee betwixt the two natures*, uſeth the word Nature for Perſon: and ſo indeed teacheth two perſons; *Quomodo Neſtorius duas dicit naturas: in which ſame ſenſe alſo Neſtorius teacheth two natures to be in Chriſt: ſed pro perſonis eas accipit, but hee taketh twoſe two natures for two perſons.* So the generall Councell.

t Edict. Juſtin. §. Credimus autem.

u Conc. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 575. b.

19. Pope *Iohn* the ſecond, doth clearly expreſſe this, ſetting downe

downe the faith of the Romane Church. *Wee* [x] *profeſſe Chriſt to be perfect in deity, and perfect in the humanity: non antea exiſtente carne, & poſtea unita verbo, ſed in ipſo Deo verbo initium ut eſſet accipiens*, his fleſh, (or humane nature) *not firſt exiſting; and then the Word being united unto it: but his fleſh taking beginning in the very Word: nec duas perſonas in Chriſto intelligimus: neither doe wee underſtand two perſons to be in Chriſt*, when wee ſay two natures to be in him, as madde *Neſtorius* thought. Thus the Pope. But no where is this more clearly and fully explained then in the Dialogue of *Maxentius*, where the Catholike diſputing with the Neſtorian, ſaith thus: *This is* [y] *the cauſe of your errror, you cannot diſcerne the difference betwixt Perſon and Nature: But underſtanding Nature to be all one with Perſon*, ye *confound* (or uſe for one and the ſame thing) *theſe two: & duas omnino perſonas, ſicut duas naturas unius filij Dei ſine dubio prædicatis: and without all doubt, you teach two perſons to be in the Sonne of God, when yee profeſſe two natures to be in him.*

x *Joh. 2. Epiſt. 3. ad Senatore.*

y *Ioh. Maxent. Dial. 1. ca. 12.*

20. By this which I have ſayd, it is now evident, that the Neſtorians ſpake like Catholikes, but they thought contrarie to Catholikes: their words were holy and orthodoxall, but their ſenſe, and meaning, was blaſphemous, and hereticall. Neither was this any new policie of the Neſtorians; The Arians, the Pelagians, almoſt all heretikes, have practiſed the like: out of them all, I will here alleage but one example. *Vitalis* [z] a Presbyter of *Antioch*, was accuſed unto *Damaſus* to maintaine in ſome part the hereſie of *Apollinaris*, as denying Chriſt to have a *ſoule* or *minde*; At the motion [a] of *Damaſus*, he delivered in writing a confeſſion of his faith. In that confeſſion, *diſertis verbis confeſſus eſt in Chriſto, ſicut carnem ita & mentem* [b]: hee in plaine termes profeſſed Chriſt to have as well a ſoule as a body. This his confeſſion ſeeming at the firſt to be ſound [c] and good, was approved for catholike, both by *Pope Damaſus*, by *Gregorie Nazianzen* and other Catholikes, who ſuſpected no hereticall fraud to lye hid under ſuch faire and orthodoxall words, for in his confeſſion of faith, *Scripturæ* [d] *verba ſine ulla depravatione collocabat, nihil prorſus immutans, nec orationis ſeriem adulterans: Vitalis had placed the very words of the Scripture, not depraved, not any way changed, neither the order, nor writing of them being corrupted.* But when *Vitalis* [e] came among his owne fellowes, to whom he opened his ſecret meaning and his fraud, as the Manichees were wont to do among their *electi*, he then told them, *That by the ſoule* [f] *and mind which hee had acknowledged in Chriſt, he meant nothing but the very Deity it ſelfe*, which unto Chriſts body, was as the ſoule & mind, to animate it with life, ſenſe, and reaſon, which was one part of the hereſie of *Apollinaris*. As ſoone [g] as Pope *Damaſus*, and *Gregory Nazianzen* knew of this fraud, they not onely rejected *Vitalis* out of their communion, but condemned as hereticall, and that alſo with an *Anathema* denounced againſt it, *Fidei*

z *Elias Cretenſ. in Greg. Nazian. Epi. 2. ad Clidon.*

a *Poſcente illo (Damaſo) ut fidem ſuam exponeret, eam ſcriptis mandatam edidit. ibid.*

b *Baron. an. 373. nu. 3.*

c *Prima fronte recta & ſana viſa (ea profeſſio) idcirco & Damaſus & hic divinus magiſter (Gregorius) eam admiſerunt, quod abditam & occultam fraudē nullo modo deprehendiſſent, nec verſutam malignitatem ſub verbis latentem. Elias Cret. loc. cit.*

d *Elias Cret. ibid.*

e *Hi cum diſcipulis ſuis abditis & myſtis, de abſconditis theologicum inſtillant ſermonem, quemadmodum & Manichei, totam eis morbum revelantes. Greg. Nazian. Epiſt. 2. ad Clidon.*

f *Animam & rationem ac mentem, (Chriſti) divinitatem ipſam introducunt, tanquam ipſa ſola carni ſit admiſta Mentem, divinitatem Chriſti dicentes. Greg. ibid.*

g *Statim ac dolum ſenſerunt, fraudulentam hominem ab eccleſia proſcribunt. Elias Cret. loc. cit.*

libellum, that very ſame profeſſion of faith made by *Vitalis*, which themſelves before had approved, which fact *Gregorie* [h] defendeth as juſt and right, both for himſelfe, and for *Damaſus*.

h *Ne nos accuſent quod Vitalis fidem prius quidem probaverimus, nunc vero repudiemus. Greg. Naz. Epiſt. 2. ad Clidon. & ſimilia habet in Epi. 2. ad Hell.*

21. From this, two things are ſpecially for our preſent purpoſe to be obſerved. The former, that an hereticall profeſſion may bee made in moſt orthodoxall termes, yea in the very words of the holy Scripture, not corrupted, not altered, not changed, for ſo was this hereticall confeſſion of *Vitalis*. The other is, that the ſelfe ſame profeſſion of faith, if wee looke onely at the words, may be allowed for orthodoxall, when the ſenſe thereof is and appeareth to bee orthodoxall, and when there is no evidence to the contrary, but that the party who makes that profeſſion, as he ſpeakes orthodoxally, ſo alſo meaneth orthodoxally: and that ſame profeſſion alſo, may juſtly bee condemned for hereticall, when by any overt act, or outward evidence, it doth certainly appeare, that the party who made that confeſſion, by, and under thoſe orthodoxall words, meant by a fraudulent, and equivocating colluſion, to expreſſe an hereticall ſenſe: for while there appeared no cauſe to miſtruſt *Vitalis*, Pope *Damaſus* and others approved his profeſſion, as orthodoxall: but as ſoone as they knew hee meant heretically, they condemned, and anathematized the very ſelfe ſame profeſſion as hereticall. The reaſon of all which is, that which the ſame *Gregory* [i], and after him *Iuſtinian* [k] expreſſeth, *quoniam eadem voces, becauſe the very ſame words*, if they bee rightly expounded, and underſtood, are pious, but if they be taken in an hereticall ſenſe, they are impious.

i *Greg. Epiſt. 2. ad Clid.*
k *Iuſt. in Edict. §. Tali.*

22. That which *Damaſus* and *Gregorie* did in the confeſſion of *Vitalis*, muſt bee done in the profeſsion of the Neſtorians: when Catholikes ſay there are in Chriſt *two natures, and one perſon*, their confeſsion is orthodoxall, becauſe they ſay it in an orthodoxall ſenſe, uſing the words as they ought to bee in their right, naturall, and uſuall ſignification: But when the Neſtorians ſay the very ſame words, their ſaying is hereticall, becauſe they ſay it in an hereticall ſenſe, abuſing the words, to an equivocall, unnaturall, and unuſuall ſignification. Nay, it not onely muſt, but it was ſayd, it was decreed in this very caſe of *Neſtorius*, and that by the whole generall Councell at *Epheſus*, themſelves being Catholikes profeſſed in Chriſt, *two natures, and one perſon*, and yet they condemned [l] and accurſed *Neſtorius*, who in words ſaid the very ſame, acknowledging in Chriſt *two natures, and one perſon*. Whoſe judgement herein being followed both by the Councell at *Chalcedon*, & this 5. Synod, & in a word, by the whole Catholike Church, is a warrant authenticall, that a profeſsion being for words, one, and the ſelfe ſame, may and ought in ſome to be judged orthodoxal, & in others condemned as hereticall, and the ſaying of old *Ennius* [m] though ſpoken to another purpoſe, is verified in this, *Eadem dicta, eademque oratio aqua non aque valet.*

l *Neſtorium duas quidem naturas, et unam perſonam dicentem Epheſina prima Synodus condemnavit. Iuſt. in Edict. §. Tali.*

m *apud Gell. lib. 11. ca. 4.*

23. It

23. It is not enough then to prove either *Ibas* to be a Catholike, or his *Epistle* orthodoxall, because in it *Ibas* professeth two natures, and one person in Christ, (for *Theodorus*, and *Nestorius* professed the very same) but the sense and meaning of his words, set downe in that *Epistle*, must be exactly considered; whether he meant not as other Nestorians, and even as *Nestorius* himselfe did; two such natures, as make two distinct persons also, and whether he called them not one person, in such a sense, as meaning that they were one, not by naturall, or personall subsistence, but onely by affection, and cohabitation. If it may appeare that this was indeed the meaning of *Ibas* in his *Epistle*, then will those words of his profession, be so farre from proving either him or his *Epistle* to be Catholike, as *Vigilius* and *Baronius* doe thence inferre, that it will demonstrate both *Ibas* in making that profession, and *Vigilius* and *Baronius* in defending it, to approve and maintaine Nestorianisme as the onely Catholike Faith.

24. But can this thinke you be shewed indeed? It may: and that most clearly, and most certainely. The Emperour *Iustinian* in his religious Edict both testifieth and demonstrates this. *Heretickes*, saith he [n], *omitting other blasphemies in this Epistle of Ibas, alleage this onely, which the Author of that Epistle spake to beguile the simple thereby*, in that he professeth *duas naturas, unam virtutẽ, unã personã, two natures, one power, one person*, which we our selves also doe confesse. *Sed certum est, quod unicuique naturæ suam personam attribuit; but it is certaine, that the Author of that Epistle (Ibas) doth attribute to eyther nature a severall person*, even as doe *Theodorus* and *Nestorius*, whom this Writer doth defend: For, they plainly teaching two natures of the Word of God, or of Christ, whom they esteeme to be no more then a man, doe call them (those two natures) one person, *per affectualem conjunctionem, by an affectuall conjunction*, and as having one dignity, and one honour. And it is cleere that the writer of this *Epistle*, saying that there is one vertue, and one power of the *two natures*; doth herein follow the foresaid heretickes, *Theodorus* in his impious booke of the incarnation, and *Nestorius* in many of his writings, but specially in his Epistle to *Alexãder*, where he saith that there is one authoritie, one vertue, one power, one person, in respect of dignitie and honour due unto them, whereby it is declared that the author of this Epistle, did according to their perfidious impiety, use *vocabulo naturarum pro personis, this word Natures, for Persons*: for one authoritie, one power, one dignity and honour, *non in diversis naturis, sed in diversis personis dicitur, is not said to bee in divers natures, but in divers persons, of the same nature*, as in the Trinitie we professe. Thus *Iustinian* both truly, and profoundly.

n Edict. Iust. §. Tali

25. The fift generall Councell witnesseth the same, and almost in the same words. *The author* (say they [o]) *of this Epistle, teacheth*

o Con. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 575.

teacheth two natures, one uertue, one perſon, one ſonne. Sed certum eſt quod pro perſonis naturas ponit, & affectualem unitatem dicit, but it is certaine that he taketh the name of natures, for perſons, and underſtandeth an affectuall unitie, even as doe *Theodorus*, and *Neſtorius*, whom this writer doth defend and praiſe: Thus both the Emperour and the whole generall approved Councell, witneſſe *Ibas* to meane by two natures, two perſons, and by one perſon, one by affectuall, not by perſonall unitie, and they witneſſe this not as a thing doubtfull, or uncertaine; but they ſeale it with a *Certum eſt, this is certaine*.

26. The *Epiſtle* it ſelfe doth ſo abundantly declare this truth, that none I thinke but a Neſtorian, can make any doubt thereof. *Maris* to whom *Ibas* writ this was a Neſtorian hereticke: The end of his writing was to confirme, both *Maris* and the reſt of that ſect in their hereſie. Had *Ibas* writ this touching two natures, and one perſon, in an orthodoxall ſenſe, he had utterly condemned that ſame doctrine, which he purpoſely commendeth; he had overthrowne Neſtorianiſme, which he by this *Epiſtle*, meant to eſtabliſh. Againe, how could hee have condemned *Cyrill* or the Epheſine Councell as hereticall, had he beleeved the *two natures* to be perſonally united in Chriſt? for that is the ſelfe ſame which *Cyrill*, and the Councell defendeth. Or how could he have commended *Theodorus*, for a teacher of the truth, who denies the perſonall, and holds onely an affectuall unitie of thoſe *two natures*, had *Ibas* meant that there had beene a true perſonall and Hypoſtaticall union of them? Take the words in the Neſtorian ſenſe, there is a perfect harmonie in the whole *Epiſtle*: take them in the orthodoxall ſenſe, the beginning will then jarre from the middle and end, this makes a diſcord in the whole writing, yea, it makes the profeſſion of *Ibas* to fight with the maine ſcope and purpoſe of *Ibas*.

27. That one place in the end of the *Epiſtle*, concerning the *union*, makes this moſt evident, *Ibas* ſaith that among other things *Paulus Emiſenus* required, and *Cyrill* conſented to anathematize thoſe who profeſſe, *quia una natura eſt divinitatis, & humanitatis, that there is one nature of the deitie and humanitie in Chriſt*. Had *Ibas* by one nature, meant one eſſence, ſo that both the humanitie, and deitie were one eſſence, why ſhould they require *Cyrill* to anathematize that? for neither *Cyrill*, nor any Catholike ever affirmed there was onely one nature, that is, one onely eſſence in Chriſt. But by *nature*, *Ibas* underſtood Perſon, and ſo its true that *Cyrill* taught one nature, that is, one onely perſon in Chriſt, whereas *Neſtorius*, *Ibas* and all the Neſtorians affirmed *two ſuch Natures*, that is, *two perſons* to be in Chriſt: according to which ſenſe *Ibas* ſaith, that *Paulus* dealing with *Cyrill* to yeeld to Neſtorianiſme, and on the behalfe of the Neſtorians, required him to anathematize thoſe who ſay there is but one *Natwe*, that is, but *one perſon* in Chriſt: and he ſlanderouſly adds, that *Cyrill* conſented

consented so to do: that is, that he subscribed indeed to all Nestorianisme, and renounced the Catholike faith, the decree of the Ephesine Councell, and his owne twelve Chapters. In which slanderous report *Ibas* insulting faith, *Non enim quisquam audet dicere quia una est natura, None dare now say that there is one nature of the divinitie and humanitie*, one nature, that is, one essence: no Catholike then, or ever, did say, but none dare now say, that there is *one Nature*, that is, *one person* in Christ, which all Catholikes both then, and ever said, and this the very next words doe declare; but now they doe professe to beleeve *in templum, & in eum qui in hoc habitat, in the temple, and in him who dwelleth in the temple*, which was the very comparison of *Nestorius* p, to expresse that the *two natures* in Christ, are *two persons*, as are the house and inhabiters, and one not by personall, but onely by affectuall unitie and cohabitation. So cleere it is that *Ibas* by his confessing of *two natures* meant *two persons*, and by confessing one person, meant one by affection, but not by personall union: that is, meant all in an hereticall, and Nestorian sense, and nothing in the true Catholike, and orthodoxall meaning.

p *Si quis dixerit Christum Deum verum esse, & non potius nobiscum deum, hoc est, inhabitasse naturam nostram per id quod unitus est nostræ, anathema sit, Nestorius in anathematismo 1. (ōtra Cyrill. anath. §. 1. in Act. Conc. Ephe. 2. c. ca. 5. in Appen. pa. 768.*

28. But what seeke I further proofe of this matter, seeing the fift Councell, approved by the whole catholike Church, hath defined the whole q *Epistle* to bee hereticall, accursing every one who defendeth it, or any part of it. An undeniable proofe, not onely that the profession of *Ibas* made therein of two natures and one person, is hereticall, but that *Vigilius* and *Baronius*, for this very point are anathematized by the whole Church, because they defend that profession in this *Epistle* as Catholike and orthodoxall, which by so many, so evident demonstrations, and even by the consenting judgement of the whole Church, is condemned for hereticall. And this I hope may suffice to explaine or illustrate the Popes meaning in the Position or conclusion which he undertakes to prove in his reason, that *Ibas* was a Catholike, in making this so orthodoxall, and Catholike a profession in his *Epistle*, of two natures and one person.

q *Tota Epistola hæretica est, Epistola per omnia contraria est definitioni a Synodo Chalced. facta. Conc. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 576. a. b.*

29. Let us now come unto the reasons, whereby our Author *Vigilius* proves this profession to be Catholike. Those are specially three, in which, because they all depend on that which hath beene declared in the position, we may be the more briefe. The first is, because *Dioscorus* r, and the *Ephesine Latrocinie* did judge both this profession of *Ibas*, and *Ibas* himselfe for making this profession, to bee hereticall, *propter hanc fidei professionem, for this profession of two natures and one person*, he condemned and deposed *Ibas*. Now the judgement of *Dioscorus* to have beene unjust, and hereticall there is no doubt, and therefore the confession of *Ibas* which hee condemned must be acknowledged as orthodoxall, and Catholike, as being repugnant to the hereticall doctrine of *Dioscorus*. A verypoore and silly collection for a Pope:

r *Dioscorus Ibam propter hanc specialiter fidei professionem qua duas naturas, unam virtutem, unam personam apertissimè confitetur, hæreticum condēnavit. Const. Vig. nu. 195.*

Pope: and I doubt not but *Vigilius* would have derided it, had not Neſtorianiſme at this time bereft him of all ſound reaſon and judgement. *Dioſcorus* and his Epheſine conſpiracie maintained the hereſie of *Eutiches*, which denieth [r] two natures at all, or any way either making one or two perſons, to be in Chriſt after the incarnation. So whether one held the ſame two natures, to make but one perſon, as the Catholikes ſaid, or to make two diſtinct perſons as the Neſtorians affirmed, it was all one to *Dioſcorus*; The very holding of two natures to bee in Chriſt, either of thoſe wayes made one an hereticke in the judgment of *Eutiches*, *Dioſcorus*, and their Epheſine Synod. The hereſie of *Eutiches* did equally contradict both the Catholike truth and the Neſtorian hereſie, becauſe they both conſented in one common truth, that there are two diſtinct natures, or eſſences abiding in Chriſt. If this judgement of *Dioſcorus* againſt *Ibas*, will prove either him or his *Epiſtle* to be Catholike, the very like effect it muſt have in *Theodorus*, in *Neſtorius*, in all Neſtorians, and in all their writings; they all with *Ibas* profeſſe two natures to abide in Chriſt, they all by the judgement of *Dioſcorus* and his Synod, are hereticall. So either muſt *Vigilius* approve all Neſtorians for Catholikes, if this reaſon for *Ibas* bee effectuall, or if they bee truly hereticks, whom *Dioſcorus* yet hath condemned, as well as *Ibas*, then is this his reaſon ineffectuall to prove from the condemnation of *Dioſcorus*, *Ibas* or his profeſſion to be Catholike.

[r] *Eutiches dixit, cõfitemur ex duabus naturis fuiſſe dominum noſtrum ante adunationẽ, poſt vero adunationẽ unam naturam confiteor. Dioſcorus & Synodus (Epheſina 2.) dixit, conſentimus huic & nos omnes. Act. Conc. Epheſ. recitata in Conc. Chal. Act. 1. pa. 28. b.*

30. His ſecond reaſon is drawne from the likeneſſe and identitie of faith in *Flavianus* and *Ibas*, *damnat* [t] *quoque propter duarum naturarum vocem*, Dioſcorus *did alſo, or for the ſame cauſe, condemne Flavianus*, for which *Ibas* was condemned, to wit, for profeſſing two natures in Chriſt. Seeing then it is knowne, that the profeſſion of *Flavianus* was Catholike, the profeſſion alſo of *Ibas* made in this *Epiſtle*, being like to that of *Flavianus*, muſt needes be Catholike; My annotation on this reaſon of *Vigilius* is, that it is inconſequent, ſophiſticall, and worth nothing at all, *Ibas* indeede in words ſaid the like with *Flavianus*, but *Flavianus* ſaid it in a Chatholike ſenſe, holding thoſe two natures to make but one perſon or perſonall ſubſiſtence, and *Ibas* ſaid it in this *Epiſtle* in an hereticall ſenſe, holding thoſe two natures to make two diſtinct perſons, or two perſonall ſubſiſtences. To *Dioſcorus* it was all one to ſay as *Flavianus* did, or as *Ibas* in this *Epiſtle* doth; for ſeeing they both jumpe in this, that two natures or eſſences doe remaine after the incarnation, they are both alike hereticks to *Dioſcorus*, though in truth the profeſſion of *Flavianus* made him a Martyr, and the profeſſion of *Ibas*, ſet down in this *Epiſtle*, being in words the ſame, make him an hereticke. Or if *Ibas* be a Catholike for profeſſing in words the ſame which *Flavianus* did, then by this reaſon of our Author *Vigilius*, *Theodorus*, *Neſtorius*, and all the Neſtorians, are Catholikes, becauſe

[t] *Vigil. Conſt. nu. 195.*

cause they all professe with *Flavianus*, *two natures, and one person to be in Christ* in the same manner as *Ibas* here doth.

31.. His third and last reason is drawne from the judgement of the Councell at *Chalcedon*; they [t] condemned *Dioscorus* and *Eutiches*, but they embraced *Ibas*: an evidence, that as they judged the profession of *Dioscorus* to be hereticall, so they esteemed the profession of *Ibas* to be orthodoxall; yea, even this which he maketh in this *Epistle*; for after that *Cyrill* had once explaned his Chapters, which was before this *Epistle* was writ, after that time, *in Catholicæ fidei rectitudine ab eâdem Chalcedonensi Synodo judicatus est Ibas permansisse*; *Ibas was by the Synod at Chalcedon judged to have continued in the right profession of the faith*. The only glosse fit for this reason is, that it is fallacious, untrue, and slanderous: fallacious; for the Councell of *Chalcedon* received *Ibas* indeed, but not for this profession made in his *Epistle*, which that holy Councell both knew, and condemned as hereticall, but, as before we have declared, for his consenting to the *Ephesine* Councell, and condemning of *Nestorius* first before *Photius*, & *Eustathius*, & then before themselves in the Councell at *Chalcedon*; upon this, whereby *Ibas* did in truth condemne his own profession made in this *Epistle*, and this whole Epistle, upon this I say; and not for professing in this Epistle two natures and one person, was *Ibas* received by the Councell at *Chalcedon*: untrue; for neither did the Councell of *Chalcedon* judge *Ibas* to have beene a Catholike, or hold the *Catholike* faith, upon the declaration of *Cyrils* Chapters; much lesse did they judge him to have continued ever after that time, in the orthodoxie of faith: slanderous; for *Vigilius* by saying that the Councell of *Chalcedon* held *Ibas* for a Catholike, upon, or shortly after the declaration of *Cyrils* Chapters, makes them all guilty of Nestorianisme: long after that explanation did *Ibas* write this *Epistle*, wherein all the blasphemies of *Nestorius*, are maintained. Had they judged him, since that Explanation to be a Catholike; they must approve this *Epistle* for Catholike, and so prove themselves to be hereticall, to be Nestorians. Thus *Vigilius*, to cloake his owne heresie, would faine fasten it upon the holy Councell of *Chalcedon*, which was so farre from partaking with *Vigilius* herein, that by their definitive sentence, this very [u] profession of *two natures*, and *one person*, made in this *Epistle*; yea, every part of this Epistle, is condemned for impious, and hereticall. And this I hope may serve for an explanation of Pope *Vigilius* his third reason to prove *Ibas* a Catholike, (drawne from this profession of faith, made in this Epistle) untill some Annalist like *Baronius* will helpe us to a better Commentary.

[t] *Vig. Const. nu. 195*

[u] *Tota Epistola hæretica est. Conc. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 576. a. b.*

32. The second reason of *Vigilius*, set downe in the words before recited to prove *Ibas* a Catholike, is drawne from his approving of the Ephesine Councell at the judgement before *Photius* & *Eustathius*; *He there*, saith *Vigilius* [x], *most plainly approved*

[x] *In Const. nu. 194.*

ved the Epheſine Synod, and the doctrines decreed therein, he profeſſed them to be equall to the Nicene decrees; Photius the Iudge, exceedingly commended Ibas, that hee was ſo forward to profeſſe the true faith, and wipe away all ſuſpition of hereſie from him: how could Ibas then be ought elſe but a Catholike, who made ſuch a Catholike confeſſion? Truely when *Ibas* made this confeſſion before *Photius* and *Euſtathius*, there is no doubt but he was then a Catholike; but *Vigilius* his purpoſe is to prove him to have beene a Catholike, when he writ this *Epiſtle*, ever [x] ſince the time that *Cyrill* explaned his Chapters; and *Baronius*, who is very ſparing of his ſpeech in this whole matter, yet both ſaw, and profeſſeth this to be the true intent of *Vigilius*; for he [y] telling us, that wheras thoſe words in the end of the *Epiſtle* of *Ibas*, [None dare now ſay, there is one nature, but they profeſſe to beleeve in the Temple, and in him who dwelleth in the Temple] were wont to be taken by the Neſtorians in ſuch a ſenſe, as if in Chriſt there were two perſons, *ne* Ibas *putaretur ejuſdem eſſe in verbis illis ſententiæ cum Neſtorianis*; *leſt* Ibas *might be thought to have the ſame meaning with the Neſtorians in thoſe words*; *Vigilius* bringeth a declaration of thoſe words, how they are to be brought to a right ſenſe, and this he teacheth, by ſhewing how *Ibas* in the Acts (before *Photius* and *Euſtathius*) embraced the Epheſine Councell. So *Baronius*: by whoſe helpe, beſides the evidence in the text it ſelfe; it now appeares, that *Vigilius*, by this profeſſion of *Ibas*, made before *Photius* and *Euſtathius*, would prove *Ibas* to have beene a Catholike when hee writ this *Epiſtle*, and that in it *Ibas* was not *ejuſdem ſententiæ cum Neſtorianis*; *of the ſame opinion with the Neſtorians.*

x *His Capitulis à Cyrillo explanatis, devotè in ejus communionem concurrit. Vig Conſt. nu. 193. poſt explanationem 12. Capitulorum Ibas profeſſus eſt ſe habuiſſe Cyrillum orthodoxum, et in cõmunione ipſius ad exitum permanſiſſe. Ibid. nu. 194.*

y *Bar. an. 553. nu. 193.*

33. A reaſon ſo void of reaſon, that I could not have held patience with the Popes Holineſſe, had not Neſtorianiſme dulled his wit and judgement at this time. The judgement before *Photius* and *Euſtathius*, was in the yeare when *Poſthumianus* and *Zeno* were Conſuls, or in the next unto it, as the Acts [z] do teſtifie, that is, according to *Baronius* account, *an.* 448. The *union* [b] betwixt *Iohn* and *Cyrill* was made in the next yeare after the Epheſine Councell, that is, *an.* 432. The *Epiſtle* of *Ibas* was writ by *Baronius* Almanacke in the very moment of the *union*; but in truth, two or three yeares at the leaſt after the *union*, as before we have proved. Now I pray you, what a conſequent, or collection call you this? *Ibas* being ſuſpected of Neſtorianiſme, to cleare himſelfe, conſented to the Epheſine Councell, and ſhewed himſelfe to bee a Catholike, ſixteene yeares after the *union*, or thirteene yeares after he writ this *Epiſtle*: therefore at the time of the *union*, and of the writing of this *Epiſtle*, he was a Catholike alſo, and not a Neſtorian. Why, twelve or ſixteen years might have a ſtrange operatiõ in *Ibas*; and there is no doubt but ſo it had? In ſo many revolutions *Ibas* ſaw, how both himſelfe and other Neſtorians were publikely cõdemned by the Church, and by the Emperour, and hated of all, who had any love to the Catholike

z *Iudicium illud Photij, et Euſtathij extat cum Actis in eo, in Conc. Chal. Act. 9. et 10.*

a *Bar. illo an. nu. 57*

b *Vt ſupra probatum eſt. Ca. 11.*

Catholike faith: He ſaw that himſelfe was perſonally called *cora nobis*, for maintaining that hereſie: he knew, that unleſſe hee cleared himſelfe before thoſe Iudges, deputed by the Emperour to heare and examine his cauſe; he was in danger of the like deprivation, as *Neſtorius*, and ſome others had juſtly felt. The ſerious and often meditation of theſe matters wrought effectually upon *Ibas*, and therefore before *Photius* & *Euſtathius* he renounced, diſclamed, and condemned Neſtorianiſme, and ſo at that time proved himſelfe, by his profeſſion before them, to bee a Catholike, as he had before that time, and ſpecially when he writ this *Epiſtle*, demonſtrated himſelfe to be, not onely an earneſt, but a malicious and ſlanderous heretike. I cannot illuſtrate the Pope, my Authors reaſon, by a more fit ſimilitude, than of a man once deadly ſicke of the Peſtilence, but afterwards fully cured and amended; for *Vigilius* his reaſon is, as if one ſhould ſay, This man was not ſicke of the Peſtilence, no not when the ſore was running upon him, and hee at the very point of death, becauſe ſome twelve or ſixteene yeares after, hee was a ſound man, cleare from all ſuſpition of the Peſtilence. Nor needeth this ſecond reaſon of *Vigilius* any further explanation.

34. We come now, in the laſt place, to that which *Vigilius* maketh his firſt reaſon in the former text; into which, becauſe hee hath compacted the very venome of the Neſtorians, wee muſt bee inforced to take ſomewhat the more paines, in our Commentary upon it. This reaſon (in which, it ſeems, the Pope puts his greateſt confidence) is drawne from the explanation of *Cyrils* Chapters, of which [c] *Vigilius* ſaith, that *Ibas* at the firſt, & before *Cyrill* had explaned them, miſconceived the meaning of *Cyrill*, and therefore ſeemed to ſpeake againſt *Cyrill*: but ſo ſoone as *Cyrill* had explaned them, and decared his owne meaning, then *Ibas*, and all the Eaſterne Biſhops forthwith embraced the communion with *Cyrill*; and ever after that, *Ibas* continued a Catholike. This *Epiſtle* then of *Ibas*, and profeſſion of faith made therein, which certainly followed the Explanation of *Cyrils* Chapters, muſt needs be Catholike, & declare *Ibas*, whē he writ it, to have been a Catholike; ſeeing, when he made this confeſſion of faith, and writ this *Epiſtle*, he held the ſame faith with *Cyrill*, and therefore no doubt held the Catholike faith. This is the full ſumme and effect of the Popes reaſon, taken from the Explanation of *Cyrils* Chapters, and for the excellency of it, it ſpreadeth it ſelfe into every part of the two other reaſons alſo, as containing an explication of them, or giving ſtrength unto them; for which cauſe wee are with more diligence and circumſpection to examine the pith of it.

[c] *Vig. conſt. nu. 192 193, 194.*

35. And that we may more clearely behold and admire the Popes *Artificium*, in handling this reaſon, we are to obſerve five ſeverall points thereof. The firſt, a peece of the Popes Rhetoricke, in that he ſaith [d] that *Ibas* before the Explanation and

[d] *Nu. 193.*

union,

union, whilſt hee doubted, and miſconceived the meaning of *Cyrill*, *viſus eſt ei obloqui*, *he ſeemed to ſpeake againſt* Cyrill *at that time*. He ſeeemed: Now *Ibas* profeſſeth of himſelfe, that hee then called [e] *Cyrill* an hereticke, that hee followed *Iohn* [f], and the Conventicle, which held with him, and ſo that with them hee counted, and in plain terms, called *Cyrill* [h] an author of ſchiſme, a diſturber of the peace of the Church, a deſpiſer of imperiall authoritie, an upholder of open tyrannie, an Arch-hereticke, and chiefe of the conſpiracie, that he condemned, accurſed, anathematized him, and that with ſuch a deteſtation, that though *Cyrill* [i] ſhould diſclaime his hereſie, yet hee ſhould never be received into their communion. Theſe and many like intolerable calumnies, and ſlanders, were the uſuall liveries, that *Ibas* and the reſt of that Conventicle, during the time of the diſunion beſtowed upon *Cyrill*; ſo vile, and malitious, that no hyperbolicall exaggeration, can ſufficiently expreſſe the impietie of them, and yet the Popes holineſſe, by the figure called *Meiωſis*, doth ſo artificially extenuate, and almoſt annihilate them, as if in all theſe, *Ibas* did but ſeeme to ſpeake againſt *Cyrill*, He ſeemed, what, to revile? nay, he ſeemed but to ſpeake againſt him: *Vigilius* was too ſparing and diminutive in his reproofe, *Non laudo*.

36. The ſecond part of his *Artificium* concernes Chronology; where he [k] ſaith, that when *Cyrill* had explaned his Chapters, *Ibas in ejus communionem devote concurrit*; *Ibas then ran, and haſtened to communicate with Cyril*. Nor did *Ibas* alone at that time accord with *Cyrill*, but he, *cum* [l] *omnibus Orientalibus Epiſcopis*, *with all the Eaſterne Biſhops*; they all then embraced *Cyrill* for a Catholike; and *Ibas* ever after that, [m] *uſque ad exitum*, *even to his dying day*, continued in the Catholike communion with *Cyrill*. Thus *Vigilius*. I cannot flatter the Pope, nor ſet any gloſſe upon this text, but this, that is utterly untrue. All the Eaſterne Biſhops did not, at the time of the *union* betwixt *Iohn* and *Cyrill*, much leſſe at the time when *Cyrill* declared his Chapters, conſent, or hold communion with *Cyrill*. Of *Theodoret* it is as evident as the Sun; for he, after the *union*, writ [n] to *Neſtorius*, that he then held *Cyrils* Chapters hereticall, and that hee would not conſent to that which was done againſt *Neſtorius*, no, not though his hands ſhould be cut off. The like is certaine of *Ibas*, for that hee continued a malicious and ſlanderous defender of Neſtorianiſme, after the *union*; this, his impious *Epiſtle*, written, at leaſt, two whole yeares after that *union*, wherein he maintaineth all the impieties of *Neſtorius*, doth demonſtrate. So untrue it is which *Vigilius* affirmeth, both in generall, that all the Eaſterne Biſhops, and particularly, that *Ibas*, upon the Explanation of *Cyrils* Chapters, which was before the *union*, conſented to *Cyrill*, and communicated with him: and much more untrue it is, that *Ibas*, ever after that Explanation, even to his dying day, remained a Catholike.

37. I ſay yet more for the further clearing of this matter, that neither

e *Donec ſeipſum interpretatus fuiſſet, quia Orientale Concilium eum vocabat hæreticum, et ut hereticum condemnavit, hæreticum eum et ego putavi. verba Ibæ, in Act. Conc. Chal. Act. 10. pa. 113. a.*

f *Quando Orientale Concilium eum, quaſi hæreticum anathematizavit, ſequutus ſum primatem meum: verba Ibæ, ibid. pa. 112. b.*

h *Ita Cyrillum vocatum à Conciliabulo Iohannis, ſupra oſtendi ca. 11.*

i *Et juravimus quod Cyrillus, etiamſi rejecerit Capitula, à nobis ſuſcipiendus non ſit, eo quod Hæreſiarches factus ſit. Epiſt. Legatorũ Conciliabuli Epheſini, to. 3. Act. ca 10. Append.*

k *Vig Conſt. nu. 193.*

l *Ibid. nu. 194.*

m *Ibid. et in Catholicæ fidei rectitudine judicatus eſt permanſiſſe. Nu. 195.*

n *Epiſtola illa Theod. extat in Conc. 5. Coll 5. pa. 558. b.*

neither all, nor ſo much as any one of all thoſe Eaſterne Biſhops, who tooke part with *Iohn*, conſented to *Cyrill* upon his declaration of the twelve Chapters, for *Cyrill* ſet forth his explanation during the time of the Epheſine Councell, while hee was impriſoned at *Epheſus*, *Cyrill*, ſaith *Baronius* [o], being left at *Epheſus*, was not idle there, but knowing that his twelve Chapters were carped at by adverſaries, leſt by their miſ-interpretations they might be infringed: *ipſe illis explanationem adjecit, himſelfe ſet out an explanation of them.* The very title prefixed to that explanation declares the ſame: which is [p], *Cyrills* explanation of the twelve Chapters, *Edita Epheſi, ſacra Synodo exigente, publiſhed at Epheſus, the holy Synod requiring Cyrill to doe the ſame.* The Neſtorians and their Conventicle witneſſe this moſt clearly: for they who ſtayed at *Epheſus*, writ thus to the Legates, whom they ſent to the Emperour at *Conſtantinople*. *We* [q] *have ſent unto you, recens factam expoſitionem ab Alexandrino, hæreticorum capitulorum, the Explanation of the hereticall Chapters lately made by Cyrill of Alexandria.* This was writ by the Epheſine Conventicle, before the diſſolutiõ of the Synod, which ended about the eight day [r] of November.

38. Now that upon this explanation publiſhed by *Cyrill*, the Eaſterne Biſhops did not conſent to *Cyrill*, nor runne to communicate with him, their owne words in the Epiſtle of the Conventicle laſt cited, doe make manifeſt, where they ſay [t] of this explanation of *Cyrill*, that he doth *evidentius per illam oſtendere ſuam impietatem, more plainly by it ſhew his impiety*, then by the Chapters themſelves. So they more deteſted that explanation then the Chapters explaned, it was more hereticall in their judgement then the other. And *Iohn* himſelfe with the other Legates, aſſented to the judgement of their fellowes: *wee are ready* [t] *ſay they to ſtrive unto death, and neither receive Cyrill, neque capitula ab eo expoſita, neither the Chapters by him explained.* Whence it is without all doubt, that neither all, nor any at all, not *Iohn* himſelfe, who was the ringleader to the reſt, did conſent to *Cyrill* and hold communion with him, upon his publiſhing that Explanation of his Chapters, or upon their knowing thereof.

39. But how long after this explanation, was it before their union and communion with *Cyrill*? *Peltanus* and *Binius* ſay [u] that thoſe jarres continued for three yeares after the end of the Councell. So directly doe they controule the Popes *Conſtitution*, wherein *Vigilius* ſo often affirmeth, that upon the publiſhing of *Cyrills* explanation they ranne to communicate with *Cyrill*: But becauſe the account of *Peltanus* and *Binius* is certainly falſe, we will not preſſe the Pope therewith. Thus much is evident, that the *union* betwixt *Iohn* and *Cyrill* was not concluded till December, in the next yeare after the Councell was ended. For *Cyrill* received neither *Iohn*, nor any of the reſt (ſave onely *Paulus Emiſenus*) till *Paulus* came the ſecond time to *Alexandria*, bringing

[o] *Bar. an. 431. nu. 158.*

[p] *Act. Conc. Epheſ. to. 3. ca. 1.*

[q] *Eorum Epiſt. extat in Append. ad to. 3. Act. Conc. Epheſ. ca. 7. append.*

[r] *Bin. in Not. ad Conc. Epheſ. pa. 922. a.*

[t] *To. 3. Act. Eph. in append. ca. 7.*

[t] *Epiſt. legatorum ad ſuos in Epheſo. in append. to. 3. Act. ca. 10. pa. 791. b.*

[u] *Duravit hæc controverſia duos aut tres annos poſt Conc. Epheſinum diſſolutum. Pax quarto demum anno impetrata eſt. Bin. Not. ante cap. 1. to. 3. Act. Eph.*

* *Vid. sup. ca. 11.*

bringing with him the orthodoxall profeſſion of *Iohn* *, and the other Biſhops with him, at which time the *union* was fully concluded, and in token thereof both *Paulus* made that his memorable Sermon at *Alexandria*, on the twenty and ninth day of the month [x] *Chyath*, which anſwereth to our December; and *Cyrill* writ that [y] Epiſtle, as an hymne of joy, which beginneth *lætentur cæli*, ſo farre were the Eaſterne Biſhops from haſtning or running as *Vigilius* ſaith to the communion with *Cyrill* upon his explanation made knowne unto them, that they all ſave *Paul*, ſtayed a full yeare and more after that explanation, before they made peace or conſented with *Cyrill*.

x *Chiath menſis Ægyptiacus quartus à Thoth, in quo eſt Æquinoctium aſtivum vid. Ioſeph. Scalig. lib. 4. de Emendi temp. in Anno Ægypt. & lib. 7. in menſium diviſ. pa. 378.*

y *Epiſt. Cyril. 28.*

40. The third part of the Popes *Artificium* is his Logicke, which in very truth is nothing elſe but trifling ſophiſtication: he ſuppoſeth that *Cyrills* explanation of the twelve Chapters, was the cauſe and occaſion of the *union* betwixt *Cyrill*, and the reſt. It was not, for that was publiſhed, and knowne unto them, more then an whole yeare before the *union*: nay that explanation did more alienate their minds from *Cyrill*, they deteſted that, more then the Chapters themſelves, as we have clearly proved; ſo far was it from effecting the *union*, that it increaſed the breach and diſ-union. The onely true, and certaine cauſe of the union, was the relenting of the Eaſterne Biſhops, from their former ſtomacke, obſtinacie, and hereſie: their ſubſcribing to all that *Cyrill* required of them, to wit, to the condemning of *Neſtorius*, and his hereſies: till they did this, *Cyrill* was unmoveable, inflexible to any *union*: as ſoone as ever this was done, *Cyrill* moſt gladly embraced them, and ſung his hymne, *Let the heavens rejoyce*, for their conſenting to the Catholike faith. *Vigilius* ſtill harps on a wrong ſtring, and fallaciouſly puts *non cauſam, pro cauſa*, which was not fitting for the Popes gravitie & judgment.

41. The fourth and fift which are the chiefe parts of my Authors *Artificium*, concerne his Ethicall, and Theologicall knowledge, which being confuſed and mingled together throughout this whole text, and manifeſting the Pope to joyne to his hereſie, ſlander, I muſt bee forced to handle them both together. Theſe conſiſt in that which the Pope ſo often beats upon, that *Cyrill* explaned his Chapters, and upon that explanation, *Ibas* and the other Eaſterne Biſhops ranne to embrace him, and his communion, what thinke you is that explanation of *Cyrills* Chapters, which the Pope ſo eagerly urgeth, and makes the cauſe of the *union* with *Ibas* and the reſt? Truly thats a myſterie indeed, and containes in it the pith of Neſtorianiſme: *Baronius* was very loath to unfold this ſecret of the Popes Art: but I hope to make it ſo perſpicuous, as that none ſhall bemone the want of the Cardinalls Commentarie in this point.

z *Cyrill. Epiſt. 28. quæ extat etiam in Act. Conc. Epheſ. to. 3. ca. 6.*

42. The Neſtorians being as *Cyrill* [z] ſaith, *tantum ad calumniandum nati, men compoſed of lyes and ſlanders*, boaſted that at the time of the *union*, the Catholikes had renounced and condemned

their

their former doctrines, and in all points consented unto them. And in particular they avouched this of *Cyrill* who was the chief agent on the Catholikes part, and who most zealously had opposed himselfe to their heresie. This hath beene so clearly proved before [z], both by the Epistles of *Cyrill*, by the writings of *Theodoret*, and by this very Epistle of *Ibas*, that I thinke it superfluous to adde ought thereunto. Now the same Nestorians being no lesse subtle, then malicious: when they spake or writ of this matter to any of their owne consorts, to their *Electi*, one of which this *Maris* was to whom *Ibas* writ, then they said in plaine termes, that *Cyrill* (and the other Catholikes) had recalled, condemned, or anathematized his twelve Chapters, and his former doctrine; as in the end of this Epistle *Ibas* tells *Maris*, and wisheth him to shew the same, *Omnibus patribus nostris pacem amantibus, to all their Fathers, to the whole society of Nestorians*, and all that loved the peace with them, that *Cyrill* did now, *contraria docere priori doctrinæ, teach the contrarie to his former doctrine*, that hee anathematized it and all that held it. Loe heres plaine dealing with *Maris*. *Cyrill* now condemneth and anathematizeth his twelve Chapters: but when they spake to men otherwise affected then themselves, to such as could not endure to heare that *Cyrill* had recanted or anathematized his former doctrine, and Chapters, then they would not use such harsh and homely words of *Cyrill*, but they would signifie the same thing, by a more facile, faire, and courteous phrase, saying *Cyrill* explaned his Chapters, and they upon his explanation, received him into their communion, and held him for a Catholike.

z *Supra ca.* 11.

43. This to be that which *Ibas* and other Nestorians meant by *Cyrills* explanation of his Chapters, the words of *Ibas* himselfe uttered in the judgement, before *Photius*, & *Eustathius*, 16 yeares after the *union*, doe make cleare; for although *Ibas* had then in the maine point renounced Nestorianisme: yet he still retained a touch or smack of their Nestorian language, hee had not as yet perfectly learned to pronounce *Shibboleth*, nor wholy weaned himselfe, or disused his tongue from those Nestorian phrases, which were so familiar in their mouthes. In those acts, *Maris* [a] accuseth *Ibas* to have said of himselfe and the other Easterne Bishops, *we would not have received Cyrill, unlesse he had anathematized his* [b] *Chapters*. *Ibas* answered: I said, that neither I nor they would have received him, *nisi seipsum interpretatus fuisset, unlesse he had explained himselfe*. And when *Maris* againe replyed, what? Did you not say, *quando flagitatum est in secreto, when you were privately*, and in secret demanded, did you not then say, I received not *Cyrill, donec anathematizasset sua capitula, till he had anathematized his owne Chapters*? *Ibas* to this answered: Truly, I remember not whether I said so or no: *Si autem dixi, verè dixi, quia orientale Concilium recepit eum sua capitula retractantem, but if I said it, I said but the truth, for the Easterne Councell received*

a *Extant in Conc. Chalced. Act.* 10. *pa.* 112. *b.*

b *Non dixisti? quia nisi anathematizasset Capitula sua, non reciperemus eum. ibid.*

ceived Cyrill when hee had recalled his Chapters, otherwiſe I would have accounted him an hereticke. So anſwered *Ibas:* plainely calling that in the one place the anathematizing, and retracting of his Chapters, which in the other he called explaining or interpreting his Chapters; but the one was ſpoken in ſecret, the other openly, and by the one which is plaine, he ſheweth what they meant by that milde phraſe of explaining Chapters, and the like words are there often repeated.

44. *Baronius* darkely ſaw, and cloſely ſignified this, when reciting the effect of *Ibas* anſwere at that judgement, he ſaith [c], that *Ibas* profeſſed, that he called *Cyrill* an hereticke, before the *union* was concluded; *poſtquam vero declarando ſua Capitula, Cyrillus iſta purgavit, & ob eam cauſam inita eſt inter eos concordia, but after that* Cyrill *by explaining his Chapters had purged them, and the union for that cauſe* (of purging them) *was once made,* never after that did *Ibas* call *Cyrill* an hereticke. So *Baronius:* declaring evidently, that whē *Ibas* ſaid that *Cyrill* expounded, or explained his Chapters, that explanation which hee meant, was in truth a purging of thoſe Chapters. And what was there, or is, in any one of thoſe twelve Chapters to be purged out? They are all & wholly [d] orthodoxall, approved in ever part, both by the holy Epheſine Councell, and after that by the Councell at *Chalcedon* [e]. Seeing in them, and every part of them there is not one dramme of any droſſe, ſeeing all of them are the pure and refined Catholike faith, if ought at all bee purged out of them, it muſt needs be a Catholike doctrine, a poſition of the Catholike faith: the purging and wiping away of any part, purgeth out the whole Catholike faith, every part of it being ſo connexed with golden linkes together, that no man can deny one unleſſe hee renounce al; nor purge out any of that vitall blood, but in ſtead thereof will ſucceed all the blaſphemous humors of the Neſtorians; Since the explanation which *Ibas* meant was joyned with a purging of thoſe Chapters, it was not, nor could it be any other but a plaine deniall, condemning and anathematizing of thoſe Chapters, and of the whole Catholike faith.

c *Baron.* 448. *nu.* 65.

d *Quod nulla ex parte ab Evangelica & Apoſtolica doctrina aberraverim, id, poſtquam Epiſtolas quas ad Neſtorium conſcripſeram* (earum una habet illa 12. *Capitula* (*ea extat. to.* 1. *act Con. Epheſ. ca.* 14.) *legiſſent, communi omnium ſententia confeſſi ſunt omnes. Cyril. Ep. ad. Imper. to.* 5. *Act. Eph. ca.* 2. *pa* 829. *a.*

e *Conc. Chal. in defin. fidei. Act.* 5.

45. This will bee more cleare, if we conſider the occaſion of this phraſe, and why the Neſtorians called that an Explanation, which (as they meant) was a condemnation of his Chapters. S. *Cyrill,* as he was moſt orthodoxall in this point for his ſenſe, ſo for his words he was not ſo ſtrict and preciſe, but ſometimes tooke the word *Nature* in an ample, and catachreſticall ſignification, for *Perſon,* but commonly in the proper and uſuall ſignification, for *Eſſence;* whenſoever he tooke it in the later ſenſe, hee never then ſaid that there was one onely nature in Chriſt, which was the hereſie of *Apollinarius,* and *Eutiches,* but hee ſtill profeſſed and maintained two natures, that is, two eſſences, againſt *Apollinarius,* to be truly in Chriſt. But when he ſaid that one Nature was in Chriſt, he then ever meant one Perſon, & not

one

one Essence. And in this use of the word [Nature] hee followed *Athanasius*, whose words he alledgeth and approveth, *we* [f] *confesse Christ to be the Sonne of God, according to the spirit; and to be the Sonne of Man, according to the flesh,* οὐ δύο φύσεις τὸν ἕνα υἱὸν, *not two natures to be one Sonne,* ἀλλὰ μίαν φύσιν, *but one nature of the Word incarnate:* Did *Athanasius* deny two essences, either the divinitie or humanitie in Christ? Nothing lesse: in that very sentẽce he professeth him to be truly God, and truly Man: but taking the word Nature for Person, hee in that sense truly denies two, and professeth but one Nature; that is, one naturall subsistence or Person to be in him. In like sort *Cyrill* himselfe, in his Epistle [g] to *Successus*, affirmeth that there is, *una natura Dei verbi incarnati, one Nature of the Sonne of God incarnate:* that is; the Sonne of God, being now incarnate is one Nature, or naturall subsistence, or one, and not two persons, and yet one consisting of two natures, that is, two essences; the divine nature assuming flesh, and the humane nature being personally united unto the Godhead: which to bee his true meaning, besides *Iustinians* [h] testimonie, infinite places doe make evident, those especially in his booke *de* [i] *fide recta ad Theodosium*, where he saith [k] *the scripture sometimes ascribes all that is spoken of Christ, to the man, sometimes all, unto God*, and speaketh right in both, *propter utriusque naturæ in unam, eandemque personam contionem, by reason that both the natures doe meete in one, and the selfe same person.* Nor may we thinke this diverse use of the same word, to be strange or unlawful; but as the name of Father, is given even in Scripture unto the Son [l], when it is taken essentially, or put in opposition to the creatures, but never when it is taken personally, or put in opposition to the Sonne; Even so, when the name of Nature is taken, (as in *Athanasius, Cyrill*, and others sometimes it is) without an opposition to Person, it may there signifie the same with Person, and note any naturall subsistence: but when in any speech there is expressed, or implied an opposition of Nature unto Person, there it ought onely to signifie the substances, or essences concurrant in in that person, and not the Person it selfe. Nor was it so great a fault in the Nestorians to take the word Nature for Person, but partly in drawing that which was the unproper, and abusive, into the ordinarie and usuall signification, (they seldome by Nature noting ought but Person) and specially for that they tooke Nature for Person, even in those very speeches wherein was noted and expressed an opposition of Nature unto Person, as in that profession which they made, acknowledging in Christ *two natures and one person*: where taking Nature for Person, they were enforced to take one Person, for one by affection, or cohabitation: neither of which truly making one person, they called that, one person, which in truth was not one, but divers distinct persons.

f *Athanasii verba apud Cyrillũ lib. de rect. fide ad Imper. to. 1. Act. Eph. Conc. ca. 5. 6. Porro. pa. 672. a.*

g *Ex Epistola Cyril. citatur a Iustiniano in Edict. §. Credimus.*

h *Ipse pater (Cyril.) quoties unam naturam dixit verbi incarnatam, Naturæ nomine pro subsistẽtia usus est, Iustin. in Edict. §. Credimus, pa. 493. a.*

i *Extat to. 1. Act. Conc. Epheſ. ca. 5.*

k *Ibid. §. Quia. pa. 666. a.*

l *Tota Trinitas est Pater noster per creationem et gubernationem, ut Esa. 63. Tu nunc Domine, Pater noster es: licet persona Patris dicatur Pater Christi per naturam. Aquin. in ca. 1 Epist. 2. ad Cor. v. 1. Et Paternitas in divinis prius importat respectum personæ ad personam, quam respectum Dei ad creaturam. Aquin. p. 1. q. 33. art. 3.*

46. This profession of one Nature, that is, of one naturall sub-

ſiſtence, or of one perſon, the Neſtorions diſliked in *Cyrill*; and in his Chapters, and thought it (but very falſly) to be the ſame which *Apollinarius* taught, as appeareth by the *Epiſtle* of *Ibas*, where he [m] thus writeth, *Cyrill* confuting the Bookes of *Neſtorius* hath written, as *Apollinaris* did, *that God himſelfe, or the Word, is made man*, ſo that there is no difference betwixt the Temple, and him who dwelleth in the Temple, for he hath written twelve Chapters, to ſhew, *quia una eſt natura divinitatis, & humanitatis, that there is one nature of the Deitie, and humanitie in Chriſt*, which thing is full of impiety. So *Ibas*, reproving *Cyrill* and condemning in his Chapters the teaching of one Nature (to wit of one perſon) ſo that according to him the temple and inhabiter in it, are one and the ſame perſon. And *Cyrill* ſo taught [n] indeed, that they were one nature in that ſenſe, howbeit in his Chapters hee doth not call them one nature; but the Neſtorians confounding Nature with perſon, upon *Cyrils* words, where in his Chapters he plainly teacheth them, to be one perſon [o], or one natural ſubſiſtence, affirmed him to ſay in them, that they were one Nature as they tooke Nature, which is true, for in his Chapters, he teacheth them indeed to bee one perſon, which in the Neſtorian language is one Nature. The very ſame by *Theodorets* words is moſt cleare, who [p] for this cauſe reproved *Cyrils* Chapters, becauſe he taught in them, *non oportere ſubſiſtentias ſive naturas dividere*, that the ſubſiſtences, that is, the Natures ought not to bee divided, and then he againſt *Cyrill*, having oppoſed that there is in Chriſt, both the perfect ſubſiſtence of God, and the perfect forme or ſubſiſtence of man, he addeth, that it is pious to confeſſe them both to be one Perſon, one Sonne, one Chriſt, and withall not amiſſe to call them *duas ſubſiſtentias, ſive Naturas, two diſtinct ſubſiſtencies or Natures united*, and often doth he teach the like, manifeſtly ſhewing, that both himſelfe, as the other Neſtorians, tooke Natures for Perſon, or perſonall ſubſiſtence, and that they condemned *Cyrils* Chapters for this cauſe, for that he denied two Natures (in that ſenſe) to be in Chriſt, that is, two perſons to be in him.

47. Now it is cleare and certaine, that *Cyrill* as well before [q], as at [r], and after [s] the *union* profeſſed *two natures*, that is, two diſtinct eſſences, or ſubſtances to be in Chriſt, but ſo, that they both concurred to make but one perſon, which is both God and Man. And it is not unlike, but that *Cyrill*, as in his writings, ſo in his ſpeeches (even to *Paulus* B. of *Emiſa*) profeſſed thus much, when he came to deale about the *union*; and in that defence of

m *Ibas in Epiſt. apud Conc. Chal. Act.* 10.

n *Locis citatis paulo ante.*

o *Si quis Dei verbũ carni ſecundum Hypoſtaſim unitum non confitetur, anathema ſit, Anath. Cyr.* 2 *Si quis Hypoſtaſes (i. Perſonas) in Chriſto diſtinguit et non connectit eas commiſtione illa quæ eſt κατὰ ἕνωσιν φυσικὴν, anathema ſit. Idem anath.* 3. *to.* 1. *Act. Conc. Epheſ. ca.* 14.

p *Theod. repreh. Capit. Cyrill. Anath.* 3 *extant ejus verba in Append tom.* 5. *Act. Con. Epheſ. ca.* 2. *pa.* 861 *b.*

q *Voces quas de ſe Servator utitur, duabus ſubſiſtentiis aut perſonis, nequaquã tribuimus. Nam etſi ex duabus rebus ipſũ diverſis in unitatem inſeparabilem coaluerit, &c. Cyril. Epiſt. ad Neſtorium ante Conc. Epheſ. extat tom.* 1. *Act. Conc. Epheſ. ca.* 14. *§ Porro.*

r *Duarum naturarum factæ eſt unio, Cyrill. Epiſt. ad Johan. Antioch. cui ſitet unio to.* 5. *Act. Conc. Eph. ca.* 6. *§. confitemur.*

s *Unam verbi Dei ſubſiſtentiam eſſe certiſſimũ eſt, quam incarnatã novimus, — — ſecundum hoc unum & ſolũ Naturarum vel ſubſtantiarum diſcrimen obſervatur Cyril. Epiſt. ad Acat. poſt unionem. to.* 5. *etc.* t *Scilicet duas eſſe in Chriſto naturas, & ſubſtantias; quas nonnunquam etiam ſubſiſtentias vocat, ut in defenſ. anath.* 1. *contra Theod. Rerum inquit ipſarum ſive ſubſiſtentiarum conventus eſt factus. to.* 5. *ca.* 1. *pa.* 860. *b. &, licet non intelligamus unitas eſſe ſubſiſtentias, def. anath.* 3. *in pa.* 863. *c. Ubi clarum eſt Cyrillum uti voce ſubſiſtentiarum non pro perſonis, ſed pro ſubſtantiis & Naturis, et ſit loquitur ſuxta uſum hæreticorum, non ut habetur apud Theod. lib.* 2. *Epiſt. ca.* 2. *Sed dicit ſe concilium ita dicebat. Nos hanc habemus catholicam fidem, μίαν ἕνωσιν, ἢν δὲ τοῦτο ἀφρονῶν ἄλλην τις ὑποτιθέμενος profitentur in deo patre & filio unam hypoſtaſin vel ſubſiſtentiam, ſed simul ſi utitur voce in ſenſu hæreticis vulgato et vulgariter intellecto, ſcilicet quod una ſit eſſentia et ſubſtantia earum non quod una ſit perſona.*

his

his Chapters, which he made in his refutation of *Theodoret*, this is often ſignified. Hence now the Neſtorians tooke occaſion of their ſpeech. They knowing that *Cyrill* profeſſed two Natures, tooke him to meane as themſelves did, *two Perſons* thereby; malitiouſly ſuppreſſing what *Cyrill* added, for the declaration of his meaning, that thoſe two natures did both make but one Perſon, or perſonall ſubſiſtence. This being concealed, and the words (Natures) being taken not for eſſences, or ſubſtances, (as *Cyrill* meant) but, as the Neſtorians miſconſtrued him, for Perſons, they with great oſtentation gave out amongſt their friends, and ſlandered *Cyrill*, to have now ſo expounded, and explaned his Chapters, as that he thereby wholy conſented unto them, and recalled and condemned all his former Chapters, and doctrine. That this was the meaning of the Neſtorians, in ſaying *Cyrill* explained his Chapters, the words of *Ibas* ſpoken before *Photius* and *Euſtathius* compared with his *Epiſtle*, makes undoubted. For what there [x] hee calls, three or foure times before them, interpreting, ſaying [y], *I my ſelfe and the Eaſtern Biſhops did not nor would receive Cyrill*: nor make *union*, nor hold communion with him, *donec interpretatus eſt, ſtill he had explained his meaning*, and interpreted thoſe Chapters, that, in other places of thoſe acts [z], as alſo in his Epiſtle [a], he in plaine tearmes calleth *anathematizing* his Chapters, & the doctrine of one Perſon taught therein, ſaying, *Paulus required Cyrill, to anathematize ſuch as profeſſe one Nature* (that is by the Neſtorian dialect) *one perſon in Chriſt*, and God inclined the heart of the Ægyptian to conſent hereunto, and ſo contention ceaſed, and peace was made, and *Cyrill*, and the reſt doe now teach *Contraria priori doctrinæ*, the quite contrarie to their former doctrine, for before *Cyrill* taught in his Chapters, as *Ibas* [b] ſaid, *that there is one Nature* (that is one perſon) & that there is no (perſonall) differēce betwixt the temple, and him that dwelleth in the temple; but now no man (not *Cyrill* himſelfe nor any other) dare ſay that there is one Nature, (that is one Perſon) of the deitie and humanitie, but all doe now profeſſe to beleeve in the temple (as one perſon) and in him who dwelleth in the temple (as another diſtinct perſon.) So *Ibas*; expreſly calling that in one place *Cyrils* anathematizing of his Chapters, which in the other he calleth the explanation of his chapters. And this the Epiſtle of *Cyrill* to *Acatius* [c] doth further witneſſe, for he hearing how the Neſtorians ſlandered him in this poinr, doth there at large declare, how by his profeſſion of two natures, he did not conſent with them, in teaching two perſons, but did ever both before and after the *union*, teach the ſame truth herein, to wit, that in Chriſt there are *two* [d] *natures*, (that is eſſences or ſubſiſtences) againſt the Appollinarians, and yet that Chriſt is but one [e] Perſon, or perſonall ſubſiſtence, againſt the Neſtorians. So untruly did they ſlander him to teach contrarie to his Chapters, or by his explaining of them, to have condemned

x *In Act. apud Photium quæ habentur in Conc. Chal. Act. 1.*

y *Ibid. pa. 113. a.*

z *Ibid. pa. 112. b.*

a *Ibæ Epiſt. in fine.*

b *Ibas in principio Epiſtolæ.*

c *Cyr epiſt. ad Acat. quæ eſt 29. et extat, to. 5. Act. Conc. Eph. ca. 7.*

d *Scripſi, me neque cum Ario, neque cū Apollinario ſenſiſſe unquam— ſed opus eſſe Naturarū obſervare differentiam, ib. §. Audivi.*

e *Neſtory cacodoxia ab hac doctrina longe diverſa eſt, nam duas Naturas nominat, eaſque a ſe invicem divellit. Deū ſeorſim ponit (ut unā perſonam) et hominem itidem ſeorſim, (ut aliam perſonam) ibid. §. Verum dicent.*

demned, recalled, and anathematized his Chapters.

48. We doe now clearly see, not onely that the explanation of *Cyrils* Chapters, which *Ibas*, and the other Nestorians of his time meant, is an utter condemning of them all; but upon what pretence and occasion they called his anathematizing, an Explation of his Chapters. If now it may further appeare, that *Vigilius* in his Constitution meant this Nestorian, and slanderous Explanation; I doubt not, but his text will bee sufficient, easie, and cleare in this point: And though none, who diligently peruseth the Popes words, can, as I thinke, doubt hereof; yet because it is not fit, in a just Commentary, to give naked asseverations, specially in a point of such moment, I will propose three or foure reasons to make evident the same. The first is taken from the correspondence and parity of the effect, which followed upon this Explanation, as the cause therof: It is no doubt but *Vigilius* meant such an explanation of *Cyrils* Chapters, as upon w^ch^, that *union* which *Ibas* held with *Cyrill*, at the time when he writ this *Epist.* ensued; for *Vigilius* proveth *Ibas* [f] at that time to have bin a Catholike, because upon *Cyrils* Explanation, he forthwith embraced the *union* with *Cyrill*, and gan to communicate with him. Now it is certaine [g], that *Ibas*, when he writ this *Epistle*, approved not the *orthodoxall*, and true *union*, which *Cyrill* truly made with *Iohn*, and the rest, upon their profession of the orthodoxall faith, sent unto him; but onely the union in Nestorianisme, the slanderous union, which they falsely affirmed *Cyrill* to have made; wherefore it certainly followeth, that the Explanation of *Cyrill*, which *Vigilius* intendeth, as a cause of that union, can bee no other then the slanderous explanation, wherein *Cyrill* was falsely said to have explaned his Chapters; that is, anathematized them, and the doctrine delivered in them: for the true and orthodoxal explanatiõ neither did, nor could effect that uniõ in Nestorianisme, w^ch^ *Ibas* embraced at the time when he writ this *Epistle*; it was the condemning of his Chapters, and in such sort to explane them, that they were anathematized; it was this, and no other explanation, which did make the union, whereof *Ibas* boasteth. Seeing then the hereticall union of *Ibas*, followed upon that explanation which *Vigilius* here meaneth, it is doubtlesse, that the explanation also which hee intendeth, is the same slanderous, & hereticall explanation, which *Ibas*, and the other Nestorians ascribed to *Cyril*, & upon which they joyned in union and communion with him. The cause was like the effect; the effect, an hereticall, and slanderous union; the cause, an hereticall and slanderous explanation.

[f] *His ab eo explanatis, in communionem ejus devotè concurrit. Vig. Const. nu. 193.*

[g] *Vt ante probatum est ca. 11.*

49. The other reason is taken from the words of *Vigilius*, which, being very pregnant to this purpose, I shall desire the reader diligently to consider the same. *Vigilius* having said [h], that, upon *Cyrils* Explanation, *Ibas*, with all the Easterne Bishops, held *Cyrill* for a Catholike, addeth this collection thereupon,

[h] *Vig. Const. nu. 194*

Ex

Ex quo apparet, By this it appeareth, *Ibas*, both before hee understood the twelve Chapters of *Cyrils*, and when he suspected one Nature to be taught thereby, *orthodoxo sensu, quod male dictum existimabat, reprobasse; then to have reproved those Chapters in an orthodoxall sense*; and also after the Explanation of them, *orthodoxo sensu, quæ rectè dicta cognoverat, venerabiliter suscepisse; then to have approved them very reverently*, and in an orthodoxall sense embraced that which he knew to bee rightly spoken therein. So *Vigilius:* plainly affirming the sense of *Ibas* to have been orthodoxall, both before, and after the Explanation, or *union* (made by *Iohn*, and all the [i] rest,) with *Cyrill*: At both those times the doctrine, sense, and meaning of *Ibas* was the same, and at both orthodoxal: and *Cyrill*, by that Explanation which *Vigilius* meaneth, declared his Chapters to have the very same meaning, and orthodoxall sense which *Ibas* had; which, when *Ibas* perceived to bee the sense of *Cyrill*, forthwith he held *Cyrill* for a Catholike, and joyned communion with him, and reverently received his doctrine, as being consonant to the sense of *Ibas*, which was still orthodoxall; so there was no alteration in the sense of *Ibas*, that both before, and after *Cyrils* Explanation, was orthodoxall, onely before the union, or Explanation *Ibas* misunderstood *Cyrils* meaning, and thought he had taught one Nature to bee in Christ, whereas *Cyrill* by his Explanation shewed, that he meant just as *Ibas* did, that there were in Christ two Natures, even in that orthodoxall sense which *Ibas* had held, as well before, as after the Explanation.

[i] *Cum omnibus Orientalibus Episcopis. Ibid.*

50. Oh what a Circean Cup is Heresie? specially Nestorianisme? Pope *Vigilius* doth now shew himselfe in his colours, and demonstrates that he is, as by some μεταμόρφωσις, quite transformed into *Nestorius*, *Theodorius*, or if there be any more hereticall than they in that kinde; for what, thinke you, was that sense of *Ibas*, which the Pope commends for orthodoxall? what was it first after the Explanation and *union* made betwixt *Iohn* and *Cyrill*? I have manifested this before, and the *Epistle* of *Ibas*, written two yeares at least after that *union*, doth make it undeniably evident, that his sense was then, *that there* [k] *are two natures, making two persons in Christ*, that the temple, and the inhabiter in the temple are two distinct persons, that *Cyrils* Chapters were hereticall, in teaching one Nature, that is, one Person in Christ; in a word, his sense then was, that Nestorianisme, and nothing but Nestorianisme was Catholike, & that the decree at *Ephesus*, against *Nestorius* was hereticall doctrine. This sense of *Ibas*, *Vigilius*, by his Pontificall and Cathedral *Constitution*, adjudgeth, and decreeth to be orthodoxall, and Catholike. Could *Nestorius* judge otherwise, or wish any other judgement?

[k] *Vt liquet ex Ibæ Epist.*

51. It may be the sense of *Ibas* was better before the *union*, and Explanation; what was it then? Truly it was the very selfe same: *So long*, saith *Ibas* [l], *as the Easterne Councell anathematized Cyrill*,

[l] *Verba Ibæ in Actis apud Photium in Conc. Chal. Act. 10. pa. 812.*

Cyrill, (which was ſtill, till the *union*) *ſequutus ſum Primatem meum, I followed my Primate,* that was, *Iohn* of *Antioch*; what his ſenſe was, and the Synods with him, that was my ſenſe. Now the ſenſe of *Iohn*, and his Conventicle, ſet downe in more than twenty Synodall Epiſtles [m] of theirs, was, *that Cyrils twelve Chapters were hereticall, contrary to the Euangelicall and Apoſtolicall doctrine, that there are two Natures, making two Perſons in Chriſt; that to teach one Nature, that is, one Perſon in Chriſt, was hereticall: that Cyrill, and all that tooke part with him, or conſented to his Chapters, were heretikes; yea, condemned and anathematized heretikes; that the holy Epheſine Councell was a Conſpiracie of heretikes, of ſeditious and factious perſons.* This was the ſenſe of *Iohn*, this the ſenſe of *Ibas* before the *union*: and this ſenſe the Popes Holineſſe hath decreed to be a Catholike and orthodoxall ſenſe: The ſenſe of *Ibas*, ſaith hee, both before the Explanation, or union, and after it, was orthodoxall; ſo, by the Pope *Vigilius* his decree, it is good Catholike doctrine to teach *two Perſons in Chriſt*; to teach, *Cyrill*, *Caleſtine*, the whole Epheſine Councell, to be heretikes, that is, in a word, to teach Neſtorianiſme, and nothing but Neſtorianiſme to be the Catholike faith.

[m] *Vid. decretum Conciliabuli tom. 3. Act. Conc. Epheſ. ca. 2. et reliquis cap.*

52. But that which I principally aimed at, out of thoſe words of *Vigilius*, was, to obſerve, that *Cyrils* Explanation here mentioned, and meant by *Vigilius*, neither is, nor can be ought elſe but an abſolute condemning, and anathematizing of his twelve Chapters; for by that explanation, which *Vigilius* intendeth, *Cyrill* ſhewed, that his ſenſe was the very ſame with that which *Ibas* had before, and after the *union*, but that ſenſe which *Ibas* had before, and divers yeares after the union, was, that the *two Natures* in Chriſt make *two diſtinct Perſons*, and that *Cyrils* twelve Chapters, in which it is conſtantly taught, that there is but one Perſon (or, as the Neſtorians ſpake, but one nature) in Chriſt, are hereticall, and to be anathematized, as being contrary to the Catholike faith; wherefore, that Explanation of *Cyrils* Chapters, which *Vigilius* intendeth, is certainly a declaring and acknowledgment, that there is not one, but two diſtinct Perſons in Chriſt; and that his own twelve Chapters, for teaching but one Perſon, are all of them hereticall, and to be anathematized.

53. The third reaſon is taken from *Vigilius* his ſcope and purpoſe in this whole paſſage: Suppoſe *Vigilius* to have meant the orthodoxall Explanation [n] ſet out by *Cyrill*, ſeeing that is wholly repugnant to the *Epiſtle* of *Ibas*, which is full fraught with Neſtorianiſme: *Vigilius* by approving that Explanation, had condemned this *Epiſtle* of *Ibas*, and every part thereof. Seeing then by that Explanation which *Vigilius* intendeth, his purpoſe is, to confirme, and ſtrengthen this *Epiſtle* of *Ibas*, and prove it to bee orthodoxall, which is onely done by approving the ſlanderous Explanation of *Cyrill* to be orthodoxall; the very ſcope, and maine purpoſe of *Vigilius* doth declare, that it is not, nor can be the orthodoxall,

[n] *Quæ extat in Actis Conc. Epheſ. to. 3. ca. 1.*

[o] *Non diceret Iuvenalis Ibam eſſe orthodoxum, niſi ex verbis Epiſtolæ, ejus confeſſionem fidei orthodoxam comprobaret. Vig. Conſt. num. 193.*

thodoxall, but the slanderous and hereticall Explanation only of *Cyrils* Chapters, which the Pope here meant, and by which, being commended for Catholike, hee indevoureth to prove the Epistle, which shewes *Ibas* to have consented most gladly, and reverently, as the Pope saith, to it, to bee indeed Catholike.

54. The fourth and last reason is taken from the fit coherence, and congruity, which this exposition of *Vigilius* meaning, hath, with his whole text concerning this matter. Take him to speake of the true and orthodoxall explanation of *Cyrill*, his words are riddles, more obscure than *Plato's* numbers, yea, they are unreconciliable to the truth of the story: *Ibas*, saith the Pope [p], *upon Cyrils Explanation, hastened and ran to communicate with Cyrill*: Expound this of *Cyrils* orthodoxall Explanation, it is utterly untrue; *Ibas* detested [q] that, more than the Chapters themselves; hee neither ranne to embrace that, nor *Cyrill* for that, hee fled from it as a serpent: and the like may be said of the rest. But take *Vigilius* to speake (as indeed he doth) of this slanderous and hereticall Explanation, and then all the words of *Vigilius* are not onely coherent among themselves, but perspicuous and easie. *Ibas* by an errour [r] mis-understood the words of *Cyrill*, (as thinking him to teach *one Nature*, that is, *one Person* in Christ) and then hee spake injuriously against him, and called him an heretike; *sed intellectu* [s] *Capitulorum meliore recepto; but when Ibas better understood the Chapters of Cyrill*, (when hee knew that *Cyrill* professed two Natures, that is, two persons in Christ; and that *Cyrill* expounded his Chapters in such sort, that the humanitie and deitie, were each a distinct person) then *Ibas* amended all that he had said amisse of *Cyrill*, and called him no more an heretike, but embraced [t] him as a Catholike. Again, *Ibas* [u] blamed *Cyrill*, while he understood not his Chapters aright; (while he thought, that but one person had beene taught therein) but afterwards, *his ab eo explanatis & intellectis*; when *Cyrill* had explaned himselfe, and *Ibas* understood his meaning, (that hee meant either nature to a several person, and so that there were two natures in *Ibas* sense, that is, two persons in Christ) then, *devotè concurrit, Ibas ran to communicate, and shake hands with Cyrill*. Againe [x], how should we not receive *Ibas*, being a Catholike, who though hee seemed to speak against *Cyrill*, while he mis-understood his Chapters; *nunc ab eo in quo fallebatur intellectu conversus; Now upon Cyrils Explanation, hee is converted from that error, whereby hee was deceived*: (for now he seeth *Cyrill* to professe two Natures, in the Nestorian sense, that is, two persons, whereas he erroniously thought *Cyrill* to teach but one Person in Christ:) Againe [y], nothing is reproved of the confession of *Ibas*, (that is orthodoxall, as teaching two natures, that is, two persons in Christ) but *Ibas* hath refuted all, *quod fallente intelligentia de Cyrillo male senserat; which hee thought amisse of Cyrill, by the errour of his misconceiving Cyrils meaning,*

p *In Const. nu.* 193

q *Missimus vestræ sanctitati recens factam expositionem ab Alexandrino, hæreticorum Capitulorum, evidentius etiam per illam ostendente suam impietatē, nisi Conciliabulum Ephes. in quo Ibas in Epist. missa Iohanni, et alijs, in Appen. ad to. 3. Act. Eph. Conc ca. 7. pa. 790. a. Nos ad mortem instare parati sumus, et neque Cyrillum, neque capitula ab eo exposita suscipere. Ibid. ca. 10. pa. 791. b.*

r *Illa quæ in Iba Epistola, in injurijs beati Cyrilli per errorum intelligentiæ dicta sunt. Vig. Const. nu.* 192. *et quod de Cyrillo, Capitula ejus aliter intelligendo detraxerat. Nu.* 193.

s *Ibid. nu.* 192. *Postea professus quia his ab eo explanatis, et à se intellectis, in communionem ejus devote concurrerit; et de his, quæ prius aliter intellexerat, sit conversus. Ibid nu.* 193.

t *Post explanationē beati Cyrilli factam, et intellectum Cyrilli sibi (Iba) declaratum, Ibas, Cyrillum, ut orthodoxum habuit, et in cōmunione ipsius permansit. Ib. nu.* 194.

u *Ibid. nu.* 193.

x *Ibid.*

y *Ex quibus evidenter declaratur in Iba Episcopo nihil de confessione fidei reprehensum, quam constat esse laudatam, sed eundem, &c. Ibid nu.* 193.

ning, (as thinking *Cyrill* to have taught but one Nature, that is, one Perſon in Chriſt.) Laſtly, the compariſon which [u] *Vigilius* ſets downe, betwixt *Ibas*, and *Dioſcorus*, is hereby made eaſie and cleare. *Dioſcorus*, though hee commended [x] *Cyrill*, and the Epheſine Councell, for teaching one Nature in Chriſt, (to wit, one Nature in *Dioſcorus* ſenſe, that is, one Eſſence) did more wrong *Cyrill*, and the Councell, than *Ibas*, who condemned them both, teaching one Nature (to wit, one in *Ibas* his ſenſe, that is, one perſon) in Chriſt: For *Dioſcorus* commended them in an execrable and hereticall [y] ſenſe, (as teaching one nature (in *Dioſcorus* ſenſe, that is, one eſſence, which to affirme is hereticall) but *Ibas* [z] condemned them in an orthodoxall ſenſe, (as thinking them to teach one nature, in *Ibas* his ſenſe, that is, one perſon in Chriſt) which to condemne is orthodoxall.) Againe, *Dioſcorus*, though it was explaned unto him, that neither *Cyrill*, nor the Epheſine Councell taught one nature, in his ſenſe, yet did hee by his hereticall ſpirit perſiſt in commending them, as agreeing with him in that hereticall doctrine; but *Ibas* [a], when it was explaned unto him, that *Cyrill* and the Epheſine Councell taught not one, but two natures, (in *Ibas* his ſenſe) by his orthodoxall ſpirit deſiſted preſently to condemne them, and then embraced them both, as agreeing with him in his orthodoxall doctrine, of two natures, that is, of two perſons in Chriſt. Laſtly, *Dioſcorus*, though hee commended them, yet becauſe hee did it in an hereticall ſenſe, and with an hereticall ſpirit, was juſtly condemned by the Councell at *Chalcedon*; but *Ibas*, though hee condemned them, yet becauſe he did it in an orthodoxall ſenſe, and with an orthodoxall ſpirit, amending what by an erroùr, and miſ-underſtanding he had done amiſſe, was approved by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and judged by them to have continued in the right Catholike faith. Thus by our expoſition, that *Vigilius* meant the ſlanderous, and hereticall explanation of *Cyrils* Chapters, is his whole text both coherent, and congruous to it ſelfe, and very perſpicuous, and eaſie; which, if *Vigilius* ſhould meane, or be expounded to have underſtood of the true and orthodoxall Explanation of *Cyrill*, would bee, not onely obſcure, and inextricable, but even repugnant, as well to the ſcope as to the words and text of *Vigilius*.

55. Thus the whole text of *Vigilius* being elucidated, it is now eaſie to diſcerne the two laſt parts of the Popes *Artificium* which before I mentioned, for now you ſee that his Divinity is meere hereſie, and Neſtorianiſme, and that his morality is unjuſtice, falſhood, and calumnie, moſt injuriouſly ſlandering, not only Saint *Cyrill*, but the holy generall Councells of *Epheſus*, and *Chalcedon* to have (like himſelfe) defended and embraced the ſame hereſies of *Neſtorius*, which by them all, is together with this decree of *Vigilius* anathematized and condemned to the very pit of hell. There needeth not, nor will I ſeeke any other cenſure

u *Ibid.nu.*195.

x *Inventus eſt Dioſcorus magis coneri Epheſinam primam Synodum deſtruere, qui eam ſub execrabilis intellectus imagine defendebat, & amplius B. Cirillum criminatus eſt, laudans eam Dioſcorus, quam Ibas ſub falſi intellectus errore vituperans. Vig. Conſt. 1bid.*

y *Hereticoſpiritu Epheſinam Synodum, & Cyrillum laudaſſe reperti ſunt Dioſcorus, et Eutiches. Ibid.*

z *At vero Ibas, qui per errorem unam putans in his prædicari naturam (id eſt perſonam) prius vituperavit Capitula, et poſt declaratum ſibi intellectum eorum (quod duas naturas Ibæ ſenſu doceret) communicatorem ſe B. Cyrilli cum omnibus Orientalibus profeſſus eſt. Ibid. nu.*195.

a *Ibid.*

ſure of this moſt ſhamefull dealing of *Vigilius*; then the very words of *Baronius* [a] concerning the Neſtorians. *Hæc cum ſciveris, perfacile intelliges: Seeing you have knowne theſe things, you may eaſily perceive*, under whoſe banner and enſigne theſe men fight: For ſeeing you have ſeene them by calumnies, lyes, and impoſtures, publiſhing counterfeit Epiſtles, (counterfeit explanations) in the names of renowned men (ſuch as *Cyrill* was) and patching lyes unto lyes, you may well know whoſe ſouldiers they are, even the miniſters of Sathan, transfiguring themſelves into Angels of Light. *Neſcit enim pura religio impoſturas, for true Religion is voyd of frauds and impoſtures*: nor doth the truth ſeeke lying pretenſes, nor the catholike faith ſupport it ſelfe by calumnies and ſlanders: ſincerity goeth ſecure, attended, onely with ſimplicity; with which cenſure of *Baronius* (agreeing indeed to all Neſtorians: but in an eminencie; and κατ' ἐξοχὴν to *Vigilius* hee being the Captaine and King of them all) I end my Commentary on the *Conſtitution* of *Vigilius*; which although it be not ſo plauſibly ſet downe as *Baronius* would have done, had hee thought good to have undertaken that office: yet I dare boldly affirme, it is delivered farre more truly, faithfully and agreeably to the text, then either the Cardinall himſelfe, or any other of the Popes *Gnathoes* would ever have performed: for as I have not wittingly omitted any one clauſe, which might breed a doubt in this obſcure paſſage; ſo have I not wreſted the words of *Vigilius* to any other ſenſe, then the coherence of his text: the evidence of reaſon, and manifold proofe out of the hiſtorical narration and circumſtances thereof doe neceſſarily inferre, and even enforce.

[a] Bar. an. 433. nu. 10.

56. My concluſion now of this ſecond reaſon of *Vigilius* and *Baronius*, for defence of this Epiſtle of *Ibas*, is this: ſeeing the one defineth, and the other defendeth both *Ibas* himſelfe, and his profeſſion in this Epiſtle, in this point, and in the ſenſe of *Ibas* to be orthodoxall, becauſe *Ibas* profeſſeth therein two natures, and one perſon to bee in Chriſt; and ſeeing as wee have certainly proved, *Ibas* meant *two ſuch natures, as make two diſtinct perſons*, and one perſon, not by a naturall, and hypoſtaticall union, but onely by affection, liking and cohabitation, which is the very hereſie condemned in *Neſtorius*: It doth hence clearly and unavoidably enſue, not onely that this *third Chapter* touching the approving of the Epiſtle of *Ibas*, doth concerne the faith, and is a *queſtion, and cauſe of faith*, but that *Vigilius* firſt, and next *Baronius*, and then all who by word or writing, doe defend either *Vigilius* or *Baronius*, or the Popes judgment in cauſes of faith to be *infallible*, that they all by defending this Epiſtle as orthodoxall; or that *Ibas* by it ought to bee judged a Catholike, doe thereby maintaine the condemned hereſie of *Neſtorius* to be the onely Catholike faith.

CHAP. XIII.

Two aſſertions of Baronius, *about the defenders of the* Three Chapters, *refuted: and two other againſt them, confirmed: the one,* That to diſſent from the Pope in a cauſe of faith, makes one neither an Heretike, nor a Schiſmatike: *the other,* That to aſſent abſolutely in faith to the Pope or preſent Church of *Rome*, makes one both an Heretike, and a Schiſmatike.

1. HAving now demonſtratively refuted the firſt evaſion of *Baronius*, I would proceed to the ſecond, but that *Baronius* doth enforce me to ſtay a little, in the examining of two Poſitions, which he collects and ſets downe touching this cauſe, the former concerning *hereſie*, the later concerning *ſchiſme*.

a *An.* 547. *nu.* 36.

2. His former is this, That [a] both the defenders, and the condemners of theſe *three Chapters* were Catholikes, neither of both were Heretikes. *Negatio vel aſſertio non conſtituebat quemquam hæreticum*; neither the condemning of theſe Chapters, nor the defending of them made one an heretike, unleſſe there were ſome other error joyned with it. Againe,

b *An.* 553. *nu.* 23.

in [b] theſe diſputations about the *three Chapters*, the queſtion was not ſuch, *ut alter ab altero aliter ſentiens, dici poſſet hæreticus: that one diſſenting from another herein, might be called an heretike*. So *Baronius*; who to free *Vigilius* from hereſie, acquits all that deale either *pro* or *contra* in this cauſe, neither one ſide, nor the other are heretikes.

3. See how hereſie makes a man to dote. That this queſtion about the *three Chapters* is a cauſe of faith, wee have cleerly and unanſwerably confirmed; and *Baronius* himſelfe hath confeſſed; That the defenders of them, and condemners, were in a manifeſt contradiction in this cauſe, (the former, by an evident conſequent and cunningly defending; the other condemning the hereſies of *Neſtorius*) is moſt evident, and yet both of them in the Cardinals judgement are good Catholikes: neither the one, who with the Neſtorians *deny Chriſt to be God:* nor the other, *who affirme him to be God*, may be called heretikes. This truly is either the ſame hereſie which the Rhetorians maintained, who as *Philaſtrius* faith [c] praiſed all ſects and opinions, and ſaid they all went the right way; or elſe it is an hereſie peculiar to *Baronius*, ſuch as none before him ever dreamed of; *That two contradictories in a cauſe of faith may be held, and yet neither of them be an hereſie*, nor the pertinacious defenders of either of them both be heretikes. *Baronius* would be famous for a peece of new found learning; and an hereticall quirke, above all that ever went before him, ſuch as by which he hath *ex condigno*, merited an applauſe of all heretiks

c *Hæreſ.* 43. *Prædeſt. lib.* 1. *Hæreſ.* 3.

which

which either have beene or ſhall ariſe hereafter. For ſeeing in this cauſe of faith two contradictories may be held without hereſie, the like may be in every other point of faith; and ſo with *Vigilius*, the Arians, Eutycheans, and all heretikes ſhall have their *quietus eſt*: ſay what they will in any cauſe of faith, none may call them heretikes. I commend the Cardinall for his wit. This makes all cocke ſure, it is an unexpugnable bulwarke to defend the *Conſtitution* of Pope *Vigilius*.

4. Say you, neither the defenders, nor the condemners of theſe Chapters may for that cauſe bee called heretikes? For the condemners of them, trouble not your wit, they are and ſhall be ever acknowledged for Catholikes. But for the defenders of them, who are the onely men, that the Cardinall would gratifie by this aſſertion, I may boldly ſay with the Prophet [d], *Though thou waſh them with nitre and much ſope, yet is their iniquity marked out*: All the water in *Tyber* and *Euphrates* cannot wath away their hereſie: for as we have before fully declared, the defending of any one, much more of all theſe *three Chapters*, is the defending of Neſtorianiſme, and all the blaſphemies thereof, the condemning of the holy Councels of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*, and of all that approve them, that is, of the whole catholike Church, and of the whole Catholike Faith. All theſe muſt be hereticall, if the defenders of thoſe *three Chapters* be not heretikes.

d Ier. 2. 22.

5. Now againſt this aſſertion of *Baronius*, whereby he would acquit *Vigilius* and all that defend him from hereſie: I will oppoſe another and true aſſertion, enſuing of that which wee have clearly proved; and this it is: That, *one or moe, either men or Churches may diſſent from the Popes Cathedrall and definitive ſentence in a cauſe of faith, made knowne unto them, and yet be no heretikes*. For to omit other inſtances no leſſe effectuall, this one concerning *Vigilius*, doth make this moſt evident. The cauſe was a *cauſe of faith*, as *Baronius* himſelfe often profeſſeth. The Popes definitive and *Apoſtolicall* ſentence in that *cauſe of faith*, made for defence of thoſe *three Chapters*, was publiſhed and made knowne to the fift generall Councell, and to the whole Church: this alſo *Baronius* confeſſeth [f], and yet they who contradicted the Popes *Apoſtolicall* ſentence in this *cauſe of faith*, made knowne unto them, were not heretikes: this alſo is the confeſſion of *Baronius*, whoſe aſſertion as you have ſeene is, that neither the condemners of theſe Chapters, nor the defenders of them were heretiks. So by the Cardinalls owne aſſertions: one may contradict and oppugne the Popes knowne, Cathedral, and *Apoſtolicall* ſentece in cauſe of faith, and yet bee no heretike. But what ſpeake I of *Baronius*, the evidence and force of reaſon doth unreſiſtably confirme this. For the whole fift generall Councell contradicted, yea condemned and accurſed the Popes Cathedrall and definitive ſentence in this cauſe of faith made knowne unto them. The whole Catholike Church ever ſince hath approved the fift

e Vid. ſup. ca. 5. nu. 14.

f An. 553. nu. 47. vid. ſup. ca. 3. nu. 80

Councell, and the decree thereof, and therefore hath contradicted, condemned and accurſed the Popes ſentence as the Councell had done. And none I hope will be ſo impudently hereticall, as to call not onely the fift generall and holy Councell, but the whole Catholike Church of God, heretikes: who yet muſt all be heretikes, or elſe the diſſenting from, yea the deteſting, and accurſing the Popes Cathedrall ſentence in a *cauſe of faith*, cannot make one an heretike.

6. I ſay more, and adde this as a further conſequent on that which hath been declared, *That none can now aſſent to their Popes, or to their Cathedrall definitions* and doctrines maintained by the preſent Romane Church, but *eo nomine, even for that very cauſe*, they are convicted, condemned, and accurſed heretikes. For the manifeſting of which *concluſion*, I will begin with that their *fundamentall* poſition of the Popes Cathedrall *infallibility* in defining cauſes of faith, whereof before I have ſo often made mention. And to prove the preſent Romane Church to bee hereticall herein, *two things* are to be declared: the one that this is indeed the *poſition* or doctrine of their Church: the other, that this doctrine is *hereticall*, and for ſuch condemned by the Catholike Church.

7. For the former; that the aſſertion of Popes *infallibility* in defining cauſes of faith, is the doctrine of the preſent Romane Church, I thinke none converſant in their writings will make doubt. Give mee leave to propoſe ſome teſtimonies of their owne. *The Pope* ſaith *Bellarmine* [g], *when hee teacheth the whole Church thoſe things which belong to faith, nullo caſu errare poteſt, hee can by no poſſible meanes then erre.* And this, as he ſaith, is, *certiſſimum, a moſt certaine truth:* and in the end hee addeth, this is a ſigne, *Eccleſiam totam ſentire, that the whole Church doth beleeve the Pope to be in ſuch cauſes infallible.* So he teſtifying this to be the judgement and doctrine of their whole Church. The Ieſuite *Coſter*, for himſelfe and their whole Church ſaith; *We* [h] *doe conſtantly deny the Popes vel hereſim docere poſſe vel errorem proponere, to be able either to teach an hereſie, or to propoſe an errour to be beleeved.* When the Pope, ſaith *Bozius* [i], *teacheth the Church, or ſets forth a decree of faith, Divinitùs illi præcluſa eſt omnis via, God then ſtoppeth every way unto him, which might bring him into errour.* Againe [k], in making ſuch decrees, *nunquam valuit aut valebit facere contra fidem, he never was, he never ſhall be able to doe ought againſt the faith.* We beleeve ſaith *Gretzer* [l], *the judgement of him who ſucceeds Peter in the Chaire, non ſecus ac olim Petri infallibile; to be no otherwiſe infallible, then the judgement of Peter was.* And the [m] gates of hell ſhall never be able to drive *Peters* ſucceſſours, *ut errorem quempiam ex cathedra definiant, that they ſhall define any errour out of the Chaire.* This is ſaith *Stapleton* [n], a certaine and received truth among Catholikes, *That the Pope when he decreeth ought out of his pontificall office, hath never yet taught any hereticall doctrine,*

g *Lib. 4. de pont. ca. 3. §. Sic.*

h *Ench. tit. de ſummo pont. §. Fatemur.*

i *Th. Boz. lib 18. de Sig. Eccl. ca. 6. §. Sequitur.*

k *Idem. lib. 16. ca. 8. §. Rurſus.*

l *Def. ca. 3. lib. 4. de Rom. Pont. §. Tertius.*

m *Idem def. ca. 28. lib. 1. de pontif. §. Quocirca.*

n *Relect. Cont. 3. qu. 4. §. Circa.*

doctrine, nec tradere poteſt, nor can he deliver any error: yea if it bee a judgement [o] of faith, *it is not onely falſe but hereticall, to ſay that the Pope can erre therein.* They, ſaith *Canus* [p], *who reject the Popes judgement in a cauſe of faith, are heretickes.* To this accordeth *Bellarmine* [q], *It is lawfull to hold either part in a doubtfull matter, without note of hereſie, before the Popes definition be given: but after the Popes ſentence, he who then diſſenteth from him is an hereticke.* To theſe may be added, as *Bellarmine* teſtifieth [r], S^t. *Thomas, Thomas Waldenſis,* Cardinall *Turrecremata,* Cardinall *Cajetane,* Cardinall *Hoſius, Driedo, Eccius, Iohannes a Lovanio,* and *Peter Soto,* all theſe teach it to be impoſſible, *that the Pope ſhould define any hereticall doctrine.* And after them all, the ſaying of *Gregory de Valentia,* is moſt remarkable to this purpoſe: *It now appeareth,* ſaith he [s], *that Saint* Thomas *did truly, and orthodoxally teach, that the propoſall or explication of our Creed, that is, of thoſe things which are to be beleeved, doth belong unto the Pope:* which truth containes ſo clearely the ſumme and chiefe point of Catholike religion, *ut nemo Catholicus eſſe poſſit, qui illam non amplectatur, that none can be a Catholike, unleſſe hee hold and embrace this.* So he: profeſſing that none are to be held with them for Catholikes, but ſuch as maintaine the Popes *infallibilitie* in propoſing or defining *cauſes of faith.*

o Rel. Conc. 6. q. 3. Art. 5. §. Reſpondeo.
p Loc. Theol. lib. 6. ca. 7 §. Quid.
q Lib. 3. de verb. Dei ca. 8. §. Extremus.
r Lib. 4. de Pont. ca. 2. § Quarto.
s In 2. 2. diſp. 1. q. 1. punct. 1 part. 30.

§ 8. They have yet another more plauſible manner of teaching the Popes *Infallibilitie* in ſuch cauſes; and that is by commending the judgement of the Church, and of generall Councels to be infallible. *All Catholikes,* ſaith *Bellarmine* [t], *doe conſtantly teach that generall Councels, confirmed by the Pope, cannot poſſibly erre, in delivering doctrines of faith or good life:* And this he ſaith, is ſo certaine, that *fide catholica tenendum eſt, it is to be embraced by the Catholike faith:* and ſo all Catholikes are bound to beleeve it. Likewiſe concerning the Church, he thus writeth [u], *Noſtra ſententia eſt, it is our ſentence, that the Church cannot abſolutely erre, in propoſing things which are to bee beleeved.* The ſame is taught by the reſt of their preſent Church. Now when they have ſaid all, and ſet it out with great pompe, and oſtentation of words, for the infallibility of the Church, and Councell; it is all but a meere colluſion, a very maske, under which they cover and convaie the Popes *Infallibilitie* into the hearts of the ſimple. Try them ſeriouſly who liſt, ſound the depth of their meaning, and it will appeare, that when they ſay; The Church is infallible, Generall Councels are infallible, The Pope is infallible, they never meane to make three diſtinct infallible Iudges, in matters of faith, but one onely *infallible,* and that one is the Pope.

t Lib. 2. de Conc. ca. 2 §. Actus.
u Lib. de Eccleſ. milit. ca. 14. §. Noſtra.

9. This to be their meaning, ſometimes they will not let to profeſſe: When we teach, ſaith *Gretzer* [x], *that the Church is the (infallible) Iudge in cauſes of faith, per Eccleſiã intelligimus Pontificem Romanum, we by the Church doe meane the Pope for the time being,* or him with a Councell. Againe [y], They object unto us, that by

x Def. ca. 10. lib. 3. de verb. Dei. §. Iam. pa. 1450.
y Ibid. §. Illa. pa. 1451.

the Church we underſtand the Pope, *Non abnuo, I confeſſe wee meane ſo in deed*, This is plaine dealing: by the Church they meane the Pope. *So Gregorie de Valentia* [z], *By the name of the Church we underſtand the head of Church, that is, the Pope.* So *Bozius* [a], The Pope *univerſorum perſonam ſuſtinet, ſuſtaineth the perſon of all Biſhops, of all Councels, of all the whole Church*, he is in ſtead of them all. As the whole multitude of the faithfull is the Church *formally*, and the generall Councell is the Church *repreſentatively*, ſo the Pope alſo is the Church *Vertually*, as ſuſtaining the perſon of all, and having the power, vertue, and authoritie of all, both the formall and repreſentative Church; and ſo the Churches or Councels judgement, is the Popes judgement; and the Churches or Councels infallibility, is in plaine ſpeech, the Popes *infallibilitie*.

z *In 2. 2. diſp. 1. q. 1.*
a *Lib. 2. de ſig. eccl. ca. 21. §. His. & lib. 14. ca. 16. §. His.*

10. This will further appeare by thoſe compariſons, which they make betwixt the Church, or Councels, and the Pope. It is the aſſertiõ of Card. *Bellarmine* [b], as alſo of their beſt [c] writers, *that there is as much authoritie Intenſivè, in the Pope alone, as in the Pope with a generall Councell, or with the whole Church; though Extenſivè it is more in them, then in him alone:* Even as the light is *Intenſivè*, & for degrees of brightnes, as great in the Sun alone, as in it with all the Starres, though it is *Extenſivè* more in thẽ, that is, more diffuſed, or ſpred abroad into moe, being in them, then in the Sun alone; Neither onely is all the authoritie, which either Coũcell or Church hath, in the Pope, but is in a far more eminent manner in him, then in them. In him it is Primitively, or originally, as water in the fountaine, or as light in the Sun; *Omnis authoritas eſt in uno*, ſaith *Bellarmine* [d], ſeeing the governmẽt of the Church is Monarchicall, *all eccleſiaſticall power is in one*, (he meanes the Pope) and from him it is derived unto others. In the Councell, and the reſt of the Church, it is but derivatively, borrowed from the Pope, as waters in little brookes, or as light in the moone & ſtarres. In him is *Plenitudo poteſtatis*, as *Innocentius* teacheth [e], *the fulneſſe of Eccleſiaſticall power and authoritie dwelleth in him*, in the reſt whether Councels, or Church, it is onely by *Participation*, and meaſure, they have no more then either their narrow channels can containe, or his holineſſe will permit to diſtill or drop downe upon their heads, from the loweſt skirts of his garment. So whatſoever authoritie either Church, or generall Councell hath, the ſame hath the Pope, and that more eminently, and more abundantly then they either have or can have.

b *Li 2. de Conc. ca. 13. § Hæc.*
c *Omnium qui docẽt papam eſſe ſupra Concilium. ibid. quos recenſet ca. 14. §. ultima.*
d *Lib. 4. de Pon. Rom. ca. 24. §. Secundo.*
e *Inn. 3. ca. 1. Cum ex eo. Ex. de Penit. & cap. Propoſuit et de Conceſſ. prebend.*

11. But for *Infallibilitie* in judgement thats ſo peculiar to him, that as they teach, neither the Pope can communicate it, unto Church or Councell, nor can they receive it, but onely by their connexion or coherence to the Pope, in whom alone it reſideth. *Poteſtas & infallibilitas papalis, eſt poteſtas & gratia perſonalis*, ſaith *Stapleton* [f], *Papall power and infallibilitie is a perſonall gift*

f *Relect. Con. 6. q. 3. art. 5. opin. 5.*

gift, and grace, given to the perſon of Peter, and his ſucceſſors; and perſonall gifts cannot bee transferred to others. In like ſort *Pighius* [g], *Vni Petro, atque ejus Cathedræ, non Sacerdotali quantocunque Concilio; the priviledge of never erring in faith, was obtained, by the prayer of Chriſt, for Peter alone, and his Chaire*; not for any Councell, though it be never ſo great. To the ſame purpoſe ſaith *Bellarmine* [h], *If a generall Councell could not erre in their ſentence, the judgement of ſuch a Councell ſhould be the laſt, and higheſt judgement of the Church; but that judgement is not the laſt, for the Pope may either approve, or reject their ſentence.* So *Bellarmine*; profeſſing the Popes onely judgement to be *infallible*; ſeeing it alone is the laſt, and higheſt, after, and above both Church, and generall Councell. All the infallibility which they have, is onely by reaſon of his judgement to which they accord, & conſent. It hence appeareth, ſaith *Bellarmine* [i], *totam firmitatem, that the whole ſtrength*, and certainty of judgement, which is even in lawfull Councels, is from the Pope, *non partim à Concilio, partim à Pontifice; it is not partlie from the Councell, and partly from the Pope*; it is wholly, and onely from the Pope, and in no part from the Councell. When the Councell, and Pope conſent in judgement, ſaith *Gretzer* [k], *omnis infallibilitas Concilij derivatur à Papa; all the infallibility of the Councell is derived from the Pope*: and a little after, when the Pope conſenteth with the Councell, *ideò non errat, quia eſt Papa; hee is therfore free from erring, becauſe he is the Pope*; and not becauſe he conſenteth with the Councell. In like ſort *Melchior* [l] *Canus*; *The ſtrength and firmitude, both of the whole Church, and of Councels, is derived from the Pope*: and againe [m], *In generall Councels, matters are not to bee judged by number of ſuffrages*, but by the waight of them; *Pondus autem dat ſummi Pontificis authoritas; and it is the Popes gravity, and authority, which gives waight to that part whereunto he inclineth*: If he ſay it, one hundred Fathers with him are ſufficient; but if his aſſent bee wanting, a thouſand, a million, ten thouſand millions; *Nulli ſatis ſunt, no number is ſufficient*: Nay, if all the whole world be of a contrary judgement to the Pope, yet, as the *Canoniſt* [n] tels us, the Popes ſentence, *totius orbis placito præfertur; is of more weight and worth, than the judgement of the whole world*: So cleare it is, that all their boaſting of the authority, and infallible judgement of the Church, and of generall Councels, wherein they pleaſe themſelves, more than ever the Iews did in crying [o] ſo oft, *Templũ Domini, the Temple of the Lord*: that all this is nothing elſe but a Viſer, to hide, or actually to draw into mens mindes the Popes *infallibility*: they having no meaning at all to give, or allow, either to Church, or generall Councell, any infallibility, but onely with a reference to the Pope, to whom alone they annex it as a *perſonall* gift, and peculiar prerogative; and who, like thoſe leane and ill favoured Kine of *Pharaoh*, hath devoured, and quite ſwallowed up all the authority, and infallibility, both of Church, and Councels: yet thus much

g *Lib. 6. de Eccleſ. Hier. ca. 1. § Et quanquam.*

h *Lib. 2. de Conc. ca. 11. § De ſecundo*

i *Lib. 4. de Pont. ca. 3. §. Contra.*

k *Defen. ca. 2. lib. 4 de Pont. § Recenſent*

l *Loc. Theod. lib. 6. ca. 7. § Quid.*

m *Lib. 5. ca. 5. § Non.*

n *Cuperr Com. in cap. Oportebat. pa. 11.*

o *Ier.*

much now is evident, that ſeeing all, who are of their preſent Romane Church, beleeve, and profeſſe the Church, and generall Councels to be infallible; & ſeeing their infallibility is none, but onely by adhering, and conſenting to the Pope; it neceſſarily enſueth, that they all, *à fortiori*, doe beleeve, and muſt profeſſe the Pope to be *infallible*, ſeeing on his, the infallibility of both the other, doth wholly, and ſolely depend.

12. Let me adde but one other prooſe hereof, taken from *Supremacy* of authoritie and judgement: It is a ruled caſe in their learning, *Si* [o] *errare non poteſt, debet eſſe ſummus judex; He who is infallible, muſt be the higheſt, and laſt Iudge*; and, *Vice verſa, He* [p] *who is the laſt, and higheſt judge, muſt be infallible. Supremacy* and *infallibility* of judgement are inſeparably linked: To whomſoever *Supremacy* is given, even for that cauſe *infallibility* of judgement is granted unto him alſo; for ſeeing from the laſt or ſupreme Iudge, there can be no appeale; it were moſt unjuſt to binde Chriſtians to beleeve his ſentence, who might be deceived; moſt unjuſt to binde them from appealing from a judge that were fallible, or from an erronious judgement. Conſider now to whom *Supremacy* of judgement in *cauſes of faith*, belongeth: To whom elſe but to the Pope? whereas ſome dare affirme, ſaith the *Canoniſt* [q], that a Councell is above the Pope; *Falſiſſimum eſt, This is moſt falſe*: The Succeſſor of *Peter*, ſaith *Stapleton*, [r] *ſupra omnes eſt, is above all*; Biſhops, Church, generall Councels; above all. *The Pope*, ſaith *Bellarmine* [ſ], *is ſimply and abſolutely above the whole Church, and above a generall Councell.* [t] Hee further tels us, that this aſſertion, *That the Pope is above a generall Councell, is, not only the judgment of all the ancient Schoole Divines, & the cõmon ſentence of their Writers*, (of whom he reckoneth thirteene, and, if it were fit, three times thirtie might bee ſcored up with them) *but that it is the publike doctrine of their Church, decreed in their Laterane Synod, under Leo the tenth*: There the Councell, ſaith he [u], *diſertè & ex profeſſo docuit, did plainly, and of ſet purpoſe teach, the Pope to bee above all Councels*: yea, *expreſiſſimè* [x] *rem definivit; that Laterane Councell did moſt expreſly define this*: and their definition hereof, is, *Decretum de fide, a Decree of faith*: for which cauſe, in his Apology, bearing the name of *Schulkenius*, hee profeſſeth [y], that this is, *Articulus fidei, an Article of faith*, ſuch as every Chriſtian is bound to beleeve, that the Pope is, *Summus in terris totius Eccleſiæ Iudex; the Supreme, laſt, and higheſt Iudge of the whole Church, here upon earth*; which he proves, beſides many other authorities, by this very *Laterane* [z] decree, and by their *Trent* Councell. The words themſelves, of thoſe Councels, make the matter plaine; in that at the *Laterane* Councell they thus decree; *Solum* [a] *Romanum Pontificem ſupra omnia Concilia authoritatem habere; that the Pope alone hath authority above all Councels*; and this, they ſay, is taught, *not* [b] *onely by Fathers, and Councels, but by the holy Scriptures*; thereby ſhewing, that in this decree

o Bell. lib. 3. de verb. Dei ca. 5. § Quinti & lib. 4. de Pont. ca. 1. § Denique. & lib. 2. de Conc. ca. 11. § De tertio.

p *Affirmant ejus judicium eſſe ultimũ. Hinc autem aperte ſequitur non errare.* Bell. lib 2. de Conc. ca. 3 § Accedat.

q Cupers com. ad cap. oporteb. pa. 4. nn. 33.

r Rel Cont. 6. q. 3. art. 5, opin. 10.

ſ Lib. 2. de Conc. ca. 17.

t Lib. eod. ca. 14. § Vltima.

u Lib. eod. ca. 17. § Denique.

x Lib. eod ca. 13. § Deinde.

y Ca. 6. § Probo. pa. 227.

z Cap. eodem. § Lateran pa. 249.

a Seſſ. 11. pa. 639. b.

b Nedum ex Scripturæ ſacræ teſtimonio, dictis ſanctorum patrum &c. Ibid.

cree they explicate & declare the Catholike faith, which is one of the Cardinals notes, to know when a decree is publiſhed by a Councell, *tanquam de fide, as a decree of faith*; and they threaten, *the* [c] *indignation of God, and the bleſſed Apoſtles, to the gainſayers of their decree*: A cenſure as heavy as any Anathema, the denouncing whereof, is another of the Cardinals notes, that they propoſed this decree, as a *decree of faith*. In the other at *Trent*, the Councell teacheth [d], that *unto the Pope is given, Suprema poteſtas in univerſa Eccleſia; the Supreme power in the whole Church*. And this *Supremacy* is ſuch, that from all Councels, all other Iudges, you may appeale to him, and hee may reverſe [e], adnull, or repeale their judgement; but from him, as being the laſt, and higheſt Iudge, as having ſupreme power, *qua* [f] *nulla eſt major, & cui nulla eſt æqualis, then which none is greater, and to which none is equall; you may appeale to none, no, not* (as ſome [g] of them teach) *unto God himſelfe*. The reaſon whereof is plaine; for ſeeing the Popes ſentence in ſuch cauſes, is the [h] ſentence of God, uttered indeed by man; but, *aſſiſtente* [i], *& gubernante Spiritu; Gods Spirit aſſiſting, & guiding him therein*; if you appeale from him, or his ſentence, you appeale even from God himſelfe, and Gods ſentence. Such ſoveraignty they give unto the Pope in his *Cathedrall* judgement. Now becauſe *Infallibility* is eſſentially, and inſeperably annexed to *ſupremacie* of judgement, it hence evidently enſueth, that as their *Laterane*, and *Trent* Councels (and, with them, all, who hold their doctrine; that is, all, who are members of their preſent Romane Church,) doe give *ſupremacy* of authority and judgement, unto the Pope; ſo with it they give alſo *infallibility* of judgement unto him; their beſt Writers profeſſing, their generall Councels defining, and decreeing, their whole Church maintaining him, and his Cathedrall judgement in cauſes of faith to bee *infallible*, which was the former point that I undertooke to declare.

c Ibid. pa. 340.

d Seſſ. 14. ca. 7.

e *Pontifex ut Princeps Eccleſiæ ſummus poteſt retractare illud judicium Concilij. Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca 18. § Dicc. Poteſt approbare vel reprobare. Idē lib. 2. ca. 11. § De tertio.*

f *Bell. lib. eodem 2. ca. 18. § Præterea.*

g *Aug. Triump. de poteſt. Eccl. q. 6. ar 8.*

h *Sententia Concilij cui præeſt Petrus, eſt ſententia Spiritus ſancti. Bell. lib. 3 de verb. Dei. ca. 5. § Sextum. Idem aſſerere poſſunt cætera legitima Concilia. Bell. lib. 2. de conc. ca. 2. § Tertius.*

i *Bell. lib. 3. de verb. Dei, ca. 10. § Decimum.*

13. Suffer mee to goe yet one ſtep further. This aſſertion of the Popes Cathedrall *infallibility* in *cauſes of faith*, is, not onely a *poſition* of their Church, (which hitherto wee have declared) but it is the very maine ground, and *fundamentall* poſition, on which all the faith, doctrines, and religion of the preſent Romane Church, and of every member thereof, doth relie. For the manifeſting whereof, that muſt diligently be remembred, which we before have ſhewed; that, as when they commend the infallibility of the Church, or Councell, they meane nothing elſe, then the Popes *infallibility*, by conſenting to whom, the Church and Councell is infallible; even ſo, to the point, that now I undertake to ſhew, it is all one to declare them to teach, that the Church, or generall Councell, is the foundation of faith, as to ſay, the Pope is the *foundation* thereof, ſeeing neither the Church, or Councell is ſuch a foundation, but onely by their conſenting with, and adhering to the Pope, who is that *foundation*.

14. This ſometimes they will not let in plaine termes to profeſſe

feſſe. *Peter*, ſaith *Bellarmine* [k], and every one of his ſucceſſors, *eſt petra, & fundamentum Eccleſiæ; is the rocke, and foundation of the Church.* In another place [l] he calleth the Pope, that very foundation, of which God propheſied in *Iſaiah*, *I* [m] *lay in the foundations of Sion, a ſtone, a tried ſtone, a precious corner ſtone, a ſure foundation: Ecce vobis lapidem in fundamentis Sion*, ſaith *Bellarmine*, *pointing at the Pope*; behold, the Pope is this ſtone, laid in the foundations of Sion: And in his Apology under the name of *Schulkenius* [n], he cals theſe poſitiõs of the Popes *ſupremacy, Cardinẽ, fundamentũ, & ſummã fidei Chriſtianæ; the Hinge, the foundation, the very ſumme of the Chriſtian faith.* To the like purpoſe *Pighius* cals [o] the Popes judgement, *Principium indubiæ veritatis, a principle of undoubted verity*; and that he meaneth the laſt and higheſt principle, his whole Treatiſe doth delare. *Coſter* obſerves [p], *that the Pope is not onely the foundation, but, which is more, the Rock:* other Apoſtles were foundations, other Biſhops are pillars of the Church; but *Peter*, and his Succeſſor, is that ſolid *Rocke, quæ fundamenta ipſa continet; which ſupporteth all other pillers and foundations.* To this purpoſe tends that aſſertion which is ſo frequent in their mouthes, and writings [q], that in *cauſes of faith, ultimum judicium eſt ſummi Pontificis, the laſt judgement belongs to the Pope:* Now if it bee the laſt in ſuch cauſes, then upon it, as on the laſt, and loweſt foundation, muſt every doctrine of their Church relie; into his judgement it muſt laſt of all be reſolved; but it, (becauſe it is the laſt) into any higher judgement, or lower foundation, cannot poſſibly bee reſolved.

15. But their moſt ordinary, and alſo moſt plauſible way to expreſſe this, is under the name of the Church, teaching men to reſt, and ſtay their faith on it; although, in very truth, as wee have ſhewed before, all which they herein ſay of the Church, doth in right, and properly belong to the Pope onely, and to the Church but onely by reaſon of him, who is the head thereof: *The* [r] *tradition of the Scriptures, and all doctrines of faith whatſoever, doe depend of the teſtimony of the Church*, ſaith *Bellarmine*. Againe, *The* [s] *certainty of all ancient Councels, and of all doctrines, doth depend on the authority of the preſent Church:* And yet more fully [t], *The faith which Catholikes have, is altogether certaine, and infallible*: for what they beleeve, they doe therefore beleeve it, becauſe God hath revealed it; and they beleeve God to have revealed it, *quoniam Eccleſiam ita dicentem, vel declarantem, audiunt; becauſe they heare the Church telling them, that God revealed it.* So *Bellarmine*; who plainly profeſſeth the teſtimony of the preſent Church, that is, of the Pope, to bee the laſt reaſon, why they beleeve any doctrine; and ſo the very laſt, and loweſt foundatiõ, on wch their faith doth relie. None more plentifull in this point, than *Stapletõ*; The externall teſtimony of the Church, ſaith he [u], *Fundamentum quoddam fidei noſtræ verè & propriè eſt; is truly and properly a foundation of our faith.* Againe [x], the voyce of the Church, *eſt regula am-*

k *Lib. 4. de Pont. ca. 3. § Secundo.*
l *Præf. in lib. de Pont. § Quæ.*
m *Iſa. 28. 16.*
1 *Pet. 2. 8.*
n *Ca. 6. pa. 255.*
o *Lib. 4. Hier. ca. 6. § Habet.*
p *Ench. ca. de ſum. Pont. § Neque.*
q *Bell. li. 4. de Pont. ca. 1. et. l. 2. de Conc. ca. 14. § Vltima. et Gretz. def. ca. 1. lib. 1. de verbo Dei. pa. 16.*
r *Lib. de Eccl. milit. ca. 10 § Ad hæc.*
s *Lib. de effect. Sacr. ca. 25 § Tertium.*
t *Lib. 6. de grat. et lib. arb. ca. 3. § At Catholici.*
u *Tripl. cont. Whit. ca. 11. § Venio.*
x *Dupl. cont. Whit. ca. 16. ſect. 4.*

nium

nium quæ creduntur; the rule and meaſure of all things which are beleeved. Againe [y], whatſoever is beleeved by the Catholike faith, wee Catholikes beleeve that, *propter Eccleſiæ authoritatem, by reaſon of the Churches authority*: we [z] beleeve the Church, *tanquam Medium credendi omnia; as the Medium or reaſon why we beleeve all other things*: And yet more fully in his *doctrinall* principles [a]; when we profeſſe in our *Creed* to beleeve the Catholike Church, the ſenſe hereof, though perhaps not *Grammaticall*, (for the Pope and his divinity is not ſubject to Grammer rules) yet certainly the *Theologicall* ſenſe is this, *Credo illa omnia quæ Deus per Eccleſiam me docuit; I beleeve all thoſe things which God hath revealed, and taught mee by the Church.* But how know you, or why beleeve you this, *Deum per Eccleſiam revelare; that all thoſe things which the Church teacheth, are revealed and taught of GOD?* What ſay you to this, which is one peece of your *Creede*? To this *Stapleton*, both in that place [b], and againe in his Relections [c], gives a moſt remarkeable anſwer; *This*, (that God reveaſeth thoſe things by the Church,) is no diſtinct Article of faith, *ſed eſt quoddam tranſcendens fidei Axioma atque principium, ex quo, & hic, & alij omnes Articuli deducuntur; but this is a tranſcendent Maxime, and principle of faith, upon which, both this it owne ſelfe,* (note this eſpecially) *and all other Articles of faith doe depend:* upon this all Articles of faith doe hang, *hoc unum præſupponunt, they all præſuppoſe this*, and take it for granted. This, and much more hath *Stapleton*.

16. But what ſpeake I of *Bellarmine* or *Stapleton*, though the latter hath moſt diligently ſifted this cauſe? This *poſition*, that the Church is the laſt Iudge, and ſo the loweſt *foundation* of their faith, is the decreed doctrine of their *Trent* Councell, and therefore the conſenting voyce of their whole Church, and of every member thereof: For in that Councell [d], *the Church is defined to bee the Iudge of the ſenſe, and interpretation of the Scriptures*: and by the like reaſon it is to judge of traditions, and of the ſenſe of them. Now becauſe all doubts and controverſies of faith, depend on the one of theſe, it clearly followeth upon that decree, that the very laſt ſtay in all doubts of faith, is the Churches judgement; but that, upon no other, nor higher ſtay, doth, or can relie; for whatſoever you take beſides this, the truth, the waight, and validity of all muſt be tried in the Church, at her judgement it muſt ſtand or fall; yea, if you make a doubt of the Churches judgement it ſelfe, even that, as all other, muſt be ended by the judgement of the Church; it is the laſt Iudge of all. This, to bee the true meaning of the *Trent* Councel, *Bellarmine* both ſaw, and profeſſeth, when hee ſaith [e], *The Church, that is, the Pope, with a Councell, is Iudge of the ſenſe of the Scripture, & omnium controverſiarum, and of all controverſies of faith*; and in this all Catholikes do agree, and it is expreſly ſet downe in the *Trent* Councell: So *Bellarmine* teſtifying this to be, both the decreed doctrine of their generall

y *Tripl. ca. 16. § At qui.*

z *Relect. Cont. 4 q. 1 art. 3. ad 8.*

a *Doct. Prin. lib. 8. ca. 21 § Hic.*

b *Ca. Eod. § Ad ſecundam.*

c *Rel. Cont 4. q. 3. art. 2. ad 8.*

d *Seſſ. 4. § Præterea.*

e *Lib. 3. de verbo Dei. ca. 3. § Tota*

generall and approved Councell; and the consenting judgment of all that are Romane Catholikes.

17. Now all this which they have said of the Church, if you will have it in plaine termes and without circumloquution, belongs onely to the Pope, who is *vertually* both Church and Councell. As the Church or Councell is called infallible, no otherwise but by a *Synechdoche*, because the Pope, who is the head both of Church and Councell, is *infallible:* So is the Church or Councell called the foundation of faith, or last principle on which their faith must relie, by the same figure *Synechdoche*, because the Pope who is the head of them both, is the *foundation* of faith. And whosoever is a true Romane Catholike or member of their present Church, hee beleeveth all other doctrines, because the Church, that is, the Pope doth teach them; and the Pope to teach them *infallibly*, he beleeveth for it selfe, because the Pope saith hee, is in such teaching *infallible*. This *infallibility* of the Pope is the ἀκρογωνιαῖος λίθος, *the very corner stone*; the foundation stone, the rocke and fundamentall *position* of their whole faith and religion, which was the point that I purposed to declare.

18. I have hitherto declared, and I feare too abundantly, that the assertion of the Popes *Cathedrall* infallibilitie in causes of faith, is not onely a *position*, but the very *fundamentall* position of all the doctrines of the present Romane Church. In the next place we are to prove that this position is *hereticall*, and that for such it was adjudged and condemned by the Catholike Church. In the proofe whereof I shall not need to stay long. This whole treatise, and even that which hath already beene declared touching the *Constitution* of Pope *Vigilius* doth evidently confirme the same. For seeing the defending of the *Three Chapters* hath been proved[f] to be hereticall, the *Constitution* of *Vigilius* made in defence of those Chapters, must of necessity be confessed to be hereticall. Nay if you well consider, you shall see, that this very *position* of the Popes Cathedrall *infallibilitie*, is adjudged to bee hereticall. For the fift generall Councell knew this cause of the *Three Chapters* to bee *a cause of faith*. They knew further that Pope *Vigilius* by his *Apostolicall* decree, and Cathedrall Constitution had defined that those *Three Chapters* ought to bee defended. Now seeing they knew both these, and yet judicially defined the defence of those *Three Chapters* to be hereticall, and for such accursed it, even in doing this, they define the *Cathedrall* judgement of *Vigilius* in this *cause of Faith*, to be hereticall; and therefore most certainly and *à fortiori* define this *position* [That the Popes Cathedrall sentence in a cause of faith is infallible] to bee *hereticall*, and for such they anathematize both it, and all that defend it. And because the judgement and definitive sentence of the fift Councell is consonant to all former, and confirmed by all subsequent Councels till the *Laterane* Synod under *Leo* the tenth, it unavoydably hence ensueth, that the same *position*

[f] *Ca.* 3. & 4.

tion of the Popes Cathedrall *infallibility* in *causes of faith*, is by the judgement of all generall Councells untill that time, that is, by the constant, and uniforme consent of the whole Catholike Church, adjudged, condemned, and accursed for hereticall, and all who defend it for heretikes. And seeing we have cleerly proved the whole present Romane Church, and all that are members therof, to defend this *position*, yea to defend it as the maine *foundation* of their whole faith; the evidence of that assertion which I proposed [g], doth now manifestly appeare: *That none can now assent to the Pope, or to the doctrines of the present Church of Rome*, but he is, *eo nomine, even for that very cause, adjudged and condemned for hereticall, and that even in the very ground and foundation of his faith.*

[g] *Sup. hoc cap. nu. 6.*

19. From the foundation let us proceed to the walls and roofe of their religion. Thinke you the foundation thereof is onely *hereticall*; and the doctrines which they build thereon *orthodoxall*? Nothing lesse; They are both sutable, both hereticall. That one fundamentall position is like the *Trojan* horse, in the wombe of it are hid many troopes of heresies. If *Liberius* confirme Arianisme, *Honorius* Monothelitisme, *Vigilius* Nestorianisme, these all by vertue of that one assertion must passe currant for Catholike truths. Nay, who can comprehend, I say not in words, or writing, but in his thought, and imagination all the blasphemous and hereticall doctrines, which by all their Popes have beene, or if as yet they have not, which hereafter may be by succeeding Popes defined to bee doctrines of faith? Seeing *Stapleton* [h] assures us, *That the Church of this, or any succeeding age may put into the Canon and number of sacred and undoubtedly Canonicall bookes, the booke of Hermas called Pastor, and the Constitutions of Clement*: the former being, as their owne notes censure it, [i] *heresibus & fabulis oppletus, full of heresies and fables*, rejected by Pope *Gelasius* [k] with his Romane Synod; the later being stuffed also with many impious doctrines, *condemning* [m] *lawfull mariage as fornication, and allowing* [n] *fornication as lawfull*, with many the like impieties, which in *Possevine* [o] are to bee seene together, for which cause they are worthily rejected in the Canons [p] of the sixt Councell; seeing the Pope may canonize these, what blasphemies, what heresies, what lies may not with them be canonized? why may not their very *Legend* in the next Session bee declared to be Canonicall? And yet by that *fundamentall position*, they are bound (and now doe *implicitè*) beleeve whatsoever any Pope either by word or writing, either hath already, or shall at any time hereafter define to be a doctrine of faith. Because I will not stay on particulars, if any please seriously to consider this matter, hee shall perceive (that which now I intend to prove) such venome of *infidelity* to lye in that one *fundamentall position* of the Popes Cathedrall *infallibility*, that by reason of holding it, they neither doe nor can beleeve or hold with *certaintie of faith*, any

[h] *Lib. 9. doct. prin. ca. 14. §. Manet.*

[i] *Notæ in lib. Hermæ. to. 5. Bibl. S. patr.*

[k] *Concil. Rom. primū sub Gelasio.*

[m] *Const. Clem. lib. 3. ca. 2.*

[n] *Idem lib. 8. ca. 32.*

[o] *Bibl. in verbo Clemens Rom.*

[p] *Can. 2.*

any one point or doctrine, which they professe to beleeve, and hold upon that *Foundation*.

20. For the clearing of which point (being very materiall) it is to be observed, that unto certainty of faith, two things are of necessity required; The one *ex parte objecti*, on the part of thing beleeved, which must be so true and certaine in it selfe, that it cannot possibly bee or have beene otherwise then it is beleeved to be, to have beene, or to be hereafter. And therefore none can truly beleeve any untruth, for nothing which is untrue, is or can be the object of faith. The other thing is required, *ex parte subjecti*, on the part of him who beleeveth. Now faith being onely of such things as are inevident, that is, which neither by sense can be perceived, nor by naturall reason collected or found out; but which are onely by the testimonie of such as first knew them, made knowne unto us, and none doth or can know that which is supernaturall, unlesse God himselfe reveale the same unto him, it hence followeth that whatsoever is by any beleeved, the same is revealed and testified to him by God himselfe, who is infallible: and further, that it is certainly knowne unto him who beleeveth, that it is God himselfe, who doth reveale and testifie that thing unto him. For otherwise though the doctrine proposed, be in it selfe never so certaine and divine; yet unto thee, or me, it cannot be certaine, nor held by certainty of faith, unlesse first we be sure and infallibly certaine, that he who testifieth it unto us is himselfe infallible, that is, that he is God. Let us for perspicuity, call the former of these two, *materiale fidei*, the materiall in faith or the thing beleeved: and the later, *formale fidei*, that which is formall in faith, seeing as the former is the thing beleeved, so the later containes the reason, the ground or foundation upon which, and for which it is beleeved.

21. Consider now first the *materials* in their *faith*. In them there is a great difference; for some of them are in themselves credible, as being divine truths, and true objects of faith. Such are all those Catholike truths common to us and them, as that there is a *Trinity, that Christ was borne of a Virgin, dyed, rose againe*, and the like. Others are in themselves untrue, such as cannot be the object of faith: Of this sort are all those doctrines wherin they dissent from us, *Transubstantiation, reall and proper sacrifice, worshipping of Images, Purgatory, Iustification* by the merit or dignity of our works, and the like, which may rightly bee called popish doctrines. The later sort of these they neither *doe nor can beleeve*. The former they *might*, but they *doe not beleeve*. The reason whereof will appeare by considering that which is formall or the fundamentall ground of their faith: where it is first to be observed, that a man may hold many, yea all the doctrines professed by the present Church, except that one of the Popes *Cathedrall infallibility*, and yet bee no *Papist* or member of their present Church. For although the things professed, or the *Materialls*

terialls be the selfe same, yet the formalitie or diverse reason of holding them, causeth a maine difference in the parties that hold them. And for our present purpose it may suffice to note three divers wayes, whereby their doctrines are or may be held.

22. The first is, of them, who build all those doctrines upon the *Scripture* as the *Foundation* thereof: upon that ground, holding not onely many Catholike truths, which they most firmly beleeve, the Church inducing, the Scriptures outwardly teaching, and the holy Spirit inwardly sealing, the same unto them: but together with those truths hold some errors also of the Romane Church (take for example *Transubstantiation*;) which although for the inducement of that present Church wherein they live, they thinke to be taught in the Scriptures, and therefore hold and professe them, and thinke they beleeve them, yet because they are neither in truth taught in the Scriptures, nor sealed by Gods Spirit unto their hearts, therefore they hold not these, nor in truth can they hold them with that firmnesse and certainty of faith, as they doe the former truths, but they have a faintnes and feare in their assent unto these, and so a readines and willing preparation of heart, to disclaime these, and to hold or professe the contrary, if ever it may be fully cleared & manifested out of the Scriptures unto them. Of this sort we doubt not but many thousands of our fathers were, who living in the darknesse & thicke mists of their Antichristian superstition, upon the Scriptures & word of God which they held for the foundation of their faith, builded indeed much gold & precious stones, but with a mixture of much hay, stubble & drosse, thinking (but very erroneously) the later as well as the former to be contained in that *foundation*. The state of all these is very like to S. *Cyprians*, and those other Africane Bishops, which were so earnest for *Rebaptizatiõ*, supposing it to be taught in the Scriptures, & though the *foundation* of it, & of those catholike truths that Christ was God, or the like, was one and the same unto them, yet they held not both with like firmnes & certainty of faith. The doctrine of Christs deity & manhood they so beleeved, that they would not cõmunicate with any that denied this, nay they would rather die then deny it. But *Rebaptization* they so held, as not thinking their opposites to be heretikes, nor refusing [p] to cõmunicate with the that denyed it; so they held this with a certaine faintnes of faith, or rather (as indeed it was) of opinion and not of faith, having a preparation in heart to beleeve, and professe the contrary, if it might at any time, be made manifest unto them. This S. *Austen* often witnesseth of *Cyprian*, *Satis ostendit se facillime correcturum*, he sufficiently declareth that hee would most easily have altered his opinion; if any would have demonstrated the truth unto him. Againe [q]; That holy man *Cyprian*, being *non solum doctus, sed docilis, not onely learned, but willing to learne*, and who sets this among the prayses of a Bishop, that

[p] *Haec rescripsimus, neminì praescribentes, aut praeiudicantes quo minus unusquisque quod putaverit faciat, habeat liberam arbitrij sui facultatẽ. Nos autem cum Collegis nostris non contendimus, cum quibus divinam & dominicam pacem tenemus.* Cyp. Epist. ad Iubaian. in fine. vid. August lib. 5. de Baptis. ca. 17.

[q] Lib. 2. de Baptis. ca. 4.

[r] Lib. 4 ca. 5.

that hee ought not onely to teach with knowledge, but learne with patience, hee I doubt not would readily have demonſtrated not onely how learned, but how willing to learne himſelfe had beene, had this queſtion in his life time beene debated, by ſuch learned and holy men, as afterwards it was. I often admire that one obſervation, among many, which the ſame [f] *Auguſtine* makes touching this error in *Cyprian*, of whom being ſo very learned, he ſaith, *Propterea non vidit aliquid ut per eum aliud eminentius videretur; He therefore ſaw not this one truth touching Rebaptization, that others might ſee in him a more eminent and excellent truth.* And what truth is that? In him we may ſee the truth of Humilitie, the truth of modeſtie, the truth of Charitie and ardent love to the peace, and unitie of the Church: but the moſt excellent truth that I can ſee, or as I thinke, can be ſeene in *erring Cyprian* is this, *that one may be a true Catholike, a Catholike Biſhop, a pillar of Gods Church, yea even a Saint and glorious Martyr, and yet hold an error in faith*, as did that holy Catholike Biſhop, and bleſſed Martyr Saint *Cyprian*. To him then and the other Africane Biſhops, who in like ſort erred as he did, may fitly be compared the ſtate of thoſe ſervants of God, who in the blindneſſe and invincible ignorance of thoſe times of Antichriſt, together with many golden truths, which they moſt firmely beleeved, upon that ſolid *foundation* of the Scriptures, held either *Tranſubſtantiation*, or the like errors, thinking them (as *Cyprian* did, of *Rebaptization*) to be taught in that *foundation* alſo. They erred in ſome doctrines of faith, as *Cyprian* did: yet notwithſtanding thoſe errors, they may be Catholikes, and bleſſed as *Cyprian* was, becauſe they both firmely beleeved many Catholike truths, and their error was without pertinacie as *Cyprians* was. For none, who truly beleeves the Scripture, and holds it for the *foundation* of his faith, can with pertinacie hold any doctrine repugnant to the Scripture, ſeeing in his very beleeveing of the Scripture, and holding it as the *foundation*, he doth in truth, though *implicitè*, and *in radice*, as I may ſay, beleeve the flat contrarie to that error, which *explicitè* he profeſſeth. And becauſe he doth *implicitè* beleeve the contrarie thereof, he hath, (even all the time while he ſo erreth) a readineſſe and preparation of hart to profeſſe the contrarie whenſoever out of the Scripture it ſhall bee deduced and manifeſted unto him.

[f] Lib. 1. ca. 18.

23. A ſecond way of holding thoſe doctrines, is of them, who together with the truths, hold the errours alſo of their Church, *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Purgatorie*, or the like, thinking them to bee taught in Scriptures, as did the former, but adding obſtinacie, or pertinacie to their holding of them, which the former did not. And their pertinacie is apparant hereby, if either they will not yeeld to the truth, being manifeſted out of the Scriptures unto them, or if before ſuch manifeſtation, they be ſo addicted and wedded to their owne wills, and conceits, that

that they reſolve either not to heare, or if they doe heare, not to yeeld to the evidence of reaſon, when they are convinced by it. For it is certaine, that one may bee truly pertinacious not onely after conviction, and manifeſtation of the truth, but even before it alſo, if he have a reſolution not to yeeld to the authority, and weight of convincing reaſons. Of this ſort were all thoſe who ever ſince their ſecond *Nicen* Synod (about which time, the Romane Church made their firſt publike defection from the true and ancient faith) tooke part with that faction in the Church, which maintained the *adoration* of Images, and after that, *Depoſing* of Princes, then *Tranſubſtantiation*, and other like hereſies, as they crept by degrees into the Church, in ſeverall ages. From that time untill *Leo* the tenth, the Church was like a confuſed lumpe, wherein both gold and droſſe were mingled together: or like a great Citie infected with the plague. All as well the ſicke as ſound, lived together within the walls, and bounds of that Citie, but all were not infected; and of thoſe that were, not all alike infected, with thoſe hereticall diſeaſes which then raigned, & more, and more prevaled in the Church. Some openly, and conſtantly withſtood the corruptions, and hereſies of their time, and being worthy Martyrs, ſealed with their blood that truth which they profeſſed. Others diſſented from the ſame errors, but durſt not with courage, and fortitude oppoſe themſelves; ſuch as would ſay to their friends in private: Thus [f] I would ſay in the ſchooles and openly, *ſed maneat inter nos, diverſum ſentio, but keepe my counſell, I thinke the contrarie.* Many were tainted with thoſe *Epidemicall* diſeaſes by the very contagion of thoſe with whom they did converſe, but that ſtrong Antidote in the foundation, which preſerved *Cyprian* and the Africane Biſhops, kept from their hearts, and at laſt overcame all the poyſon wherewith they were infected. Onely that violent, and ſtrong faction, which pertinaciouſly adhered to the hereticall doctrines, which then ſprung up, (the head of which faction was the Pope) and who preferred their owne opinions, before the truth, out of the Scriptures manifeſted unto them, and by ſome Councels, alſo decreed, as namely by that at *Conſtantinople* in the time of *Conſtantinus Iconomachus*, and that at *Frankford*, theſe I ſay who wilfully and maliciouſly reſiſted, yea perſecuted the truth and ſuch as ſtood in defence of it, are thoſe, who are ranked in this ſecond order, who though they are not in proprietie of ſpeech to bee called Papiſts, yet becauſe the errors which they held are the ſame, which the Popiſh Church now maintaineth, they are truly and properly to be tearmed *Popiſh Heretickes*.

[f] *Paralip. ad Abb. Vſperg. pa. 448.*

24. The third way of holding their doctrines, beganne with their *Lateran* decree, under *Leo* the tenth, at which time they held the ſame doctrines which they did before, but they held thē now upon another *Foundation*. For thē they caſt away the old

and ſure *Foundation*, and laid a new one of their owne in the roome thereof, The Popes word, in ſtead of Gods, and Antichriſts in ſtead of Chriſts. For although the Pope long before that time, had made no ſmall progreſſe in Antichriſtianiſme, firſt in uſurping an univerſall authority over all Biſhops, next in upholding their impious doctrines of *Adoration* of Images, and the like, and after that in exalting himſelfe above all Kings and Emperors, giving and taking away their Crownes at his pleaſure; yet the height of the Antichriſtian myſterie conſiſted in none of theſe, nor did he ever attaine unto it, till by vertue of that Laterane decree he had juſtled out Chriſt and his word, and laid himſelfe and his owne word in the ſtead thereof, for the Rocke & *Foundation* of the Catholike faith. In the firſt, the Pope was but Antichriſt *naſcent*; In the ſecond, Antichriſt *creſcent*; In the third, Antichriſt *regnant*; but in this fourth, he is made Lord of the Catholike faith, and Antichriſt *triumphant*; ſet up as God in the Church of God, ruling, nay tyrannizing, not onely in the externall and temporall eſtates, but even in the faith, and Conſciences of all men; ſo that they may beleeve neither more, nor leſſe, nor otherwiſe then he preſcribeth, nay that they may not beleeve the very Scriptures themſelves, and word of God, or that there are any Scriptures at all, or that there is a God, but for this reaſon, *ipſe dixit*, becauſe *he ſaith ſo*, and his ſaying, being a *Tranſcēdent principle of faith*, they muſt beleeve for it ſelfe, *quia ipſe dixit, becauſe he ſaith ſo*. In the firſt, and ſecond, hee uſurped the authority and place but of Biſhops; in the third, but of Kings: but in making himſelfe the Rocke and *Foundation* of faith, he intrudes himſelfe into the moſt proper office and prerogative of Ieſus Chriſt, *For* [t] *other foundation can no man lay, then that which is laid, Ieſus Chriſt.*

t 1 Cor. 3. 11.

25. Here was now quite a new face of the Romane Church, yea, it was now made a new Church of it ſelfe, in the very eſſence thereof diſtinct from the other part of the Church, and from that which it was before. For although moſt of the *Materialls*, as *Adoration* of Images, *Tranſubſtantiation*, and the reſt, were the ſame, yet the *Formalitie* and foundation of their faith and Church was quite altered. Before they beleeved the Pope to doe rightly, in decreeing Tranſubſtantiation, becauſe they beleeued the Scriptures, and word of God, to teach and warrant that doctrine: but now *vice verſa* they beleeve the Scriptures, and word of God, to teach Tranſubſtantiation, becauſe the Pope hath decreed and warranted the ſame. Till then one might be a good Catholike, and member of their Church, ſuch as were the Biſhops in the generall Councels of *Conſtance* and *Baſill*, and thoſe of the fift, ſixt, ſeventh, and ſucceding Councels, and yet hold the Popes *Cathedrall* judgement in cauſes of faith to bee not onely *fallible*, but *hereticall* and accurſed, as all thoſe Councels did: But ſince *Supremacie*, and with it *Infallibilitie* of judgement,

judgement,is, by their *Laterane* decree, transferred to the Pope: he who now gainſayeth the Popes ſentence, in a cauſe of faith, is none of their Church, as out of *Gregory de Valentia, he is an heretike*, as out of *Stapleton, Canus*, and *Bellarmine* was [u] declared: He may as well deny all the Articles of his *Creed*, and every text in the whole Bible, as deny this one point; for in denying it, he doth *eo ipſo*, by their doctrine *implicitè*, and in effect, deny them all, ſeeing he rejects that formall reaſon, for which, and that *foundation* upon which, they are all to be beleeved; and without beleefe of which, not one of them all can be now beleeved.

u *Sup. hoc cap. nu. 7*

26. Theſe then of this third ſort are truly to be counted members of their preſent Romane Church; theſe, who lay this new, & *Laterane foundatiõ*, for the ground of their faith, whether *explicitè*, as do the learned, or *implicitè*, as do the ſimpler ſort in their Church, who wilfully blind-folding themſelves, and gladly perſiſting in their affectate and ſupine ignorance, either will not uſe the meanes to ſee, or ſeeing, will not embrace the truth, but content themſelves with the *Colliars* [x] *Catechiſme*, and wrap up their owne in the Churches faith, ſaying, *I beleeve as the Church beleeveth*, and the Church beleeveth what the Pope teacheth. All theſe, and onely theſe are members of their preſent Church, unto whom, of all names, as that of *Catholikes*, is moſt unſutable, and moſt unjuſtly arrogated by themſelves; ſo, the name of *Papiſts*, or, which is equivalent, *Antichriſtians*, doth moſt fitly, truly, and in propriety of ſpeech, belong unto them: For ſeeing *forma dat nomen, & eſſe*, whence rather ſhould they have their eſſentiall appellation, then from him, who giveth life, formality, and eſſence to their faith, on whom, as on the Rocke, and corner-ſtone, their whole faith dependeth. The ſaying of *Caſſander* to this purpoſe, is worthy remembring: *There are ſome*, ſaith hee [y], *who will not permit the preſent ſtate of the Church, though it be corrupted, to be changed or reformed*; and who, *Pontificem Romanum quem Papam dicimus, tantùm non deum faciunt; make the Biſhop of Rome, whom we call the Pope, almoſt a god; preferring his authority, not onely above the whole Church, but above the Sacred Scripture, holding his judgement equall to the divine Oracles, and an infallible* rule of faith; *Hos non video, cur minus Pſeudo-catholicos, & Papiſtas appellare poſsis; I ſee no reaſon, but that theſe men ſhould be called Pſeudo-catholikes, or Papiſts.* Thus *Caſſander*; upon whoſe judicious obſervatiõ it followeth, that ſeeing their whole Church, and all the members thereof, preferre the Popes authority above the whole Church, above all generall Councels, and *quoad nos*, (which is *Caſſanders* meaning) above [z] the Scriptures alſo; defending them not to be [a] authenticall, but by the authority of the Church; that there is, *multo* [b] *major authoritas, much more authoritie in the Church, than in them*; that it is no [c] abſurd, nay, it may be a pious [d] ſaying, *That the Scriptures without the authoritie of the Church, are no more worth than Æſops Fables*: ſeeing they all, with

x *Hoſ. de author. ſac. Script. lib. 3. § Quærit.*

y *Lib. de offic. viri pij. § Sunt aly.*

z *Ecce poteſtas Eccleſiæ ſupra Script. Enchyr. tit. de Eccleſ.*
a *Enchyr. Ibid.*
b *Th. Bez. lib. de ſignu Eccl. 16. ca. 10. § Illud.*
c *Non adeo abſurde dictum eſt, &c. Gretz. Appen. 2. ad lib. 1. de verb. dei pa. 306.*
d *Potuit illud pio ſenſu dici. Hoſ. lib. 3. de author. Script. § Fingamus.*

with one conſent make the Pope the laſt, ſupreme, and *infallible* Iudge in all cauſes of faith; there can bee no name deviſed more proper and fit for them, than that of Papiſts; or, which is all one, Antichriſtians, both which expreſſe their eſſentiall dependence on the Pope, or Antichriſt, as on the *foundation* of their faith; which name moſt eſſentially alſo differenceth them from all others, which are not of their preſent Church; eſpecially from true Catholikes, or the Reformed Churches; ſeeing, as we make Chriſt and his word, ſo they on the contrary, make the Pope, that is to ſay, Antichriſt, and his word, the ground and *foundation* of faith: In regard wherof, as the faith & religion of the one is from Chriſt truly called, Chriſtian, and they truly, Chriſtians; ſo the faith and religion of the other, is from the Pope, or Antichriſt, truly, and properly called Papiſme, or Antichriſtianiſme, and the profeſſors of it Papiſts, or Antichriſtians. And whereas *Bellarmine* [e] glorieth of this very name of Papiſts, that it doth, *atteſtari veritati, give teſtimony to that truth which they profeſſe*; truly we envy not ſo apt a name unto them: Onely the Cardinal ſhews himſelf a very unskilful Herald in the blazony of this coat, & the deſcēt of this title unto them. He fetcheth [f] it forſooth frō Pope *Clement*, Pope *Peter*, and Pope *Chriſt*: Phy, it is of no ſuch antiquity, nor of ſo honourable a race. Their owne *Briſtow* will aſſure him, *that this name was never heard of till the dayes of Leo the tenth.* Neither are they ſo called, (as the Cardinall fancieth) becauſe they hold communion in faith with the Pope, which, for ſixe hundred yeares and more, all Chriſtians did, and yet were not Papiſts, nor ever ſo called; but becauſe they hold the Popes judgement to be ſupreme, and *infallible*; and ſo build their faith on him, as on the *foundation* thereof, which their owne Church never did, till the time of *Leo* the tenth. It is not then the Lion of the Tribe of *Iudah*, but the Lion of that *Laterane* Synod, who is the firſt Godfather of that name unto them, when hee had once laid the Pope as the *foundation* of faith in ſtead of Chriſt; they who then builded their faith upon this new *foundation*, were fitly chriſtened with this name of Papiſts, to diſtinguiſh them, and their preſent Romane Church from all others, who held the old, good, and ſure *foundation*.

[e] *Lib. de not. Eccl. ca. 4.*

[f] *Papiſta deducitur à Papa, qui eſt Petrus, & Chriſtus ipſe. Ibid.*

[g] *Demand. 8.*

26. You ſee now the great diuerſity which ariſeth from the divers manner of holding the ſame doctrines. The errours maintained by all thoſe three ſorts, of which I have ſpoken, are almoſt the ſame, and materially they are Popiſh hereſies; and yet the firſt ſort did onely erre therein, but were not *heretikes*, becauſe not pertinacious. The ſecond doe not onely erre, but by adding pertinacy to errour, are truly *heretikes*, but yet not *Papiſts*, becauſe they hold thoſe Popiſh hereſies in another manner, and on another foundation then Papiſts doe. The third, and laſt ſort, which containeth all, and onely thoſe who are members of the preſent Romane Church, doe both erre, and are *heretikes*; and, which

which is the worſt degree of hereſie, are *Papiſts*, that is, *Antichriſtian heretikes*; not onely holding, and that in the higheſt degree of pertinacy, thoſe hereſies which are contrary to the faith, but holding them upon that *foundation* which quite overthroweth the faith.

27. By this now doth the evidence of that truth appeare, which before[h] I propoſed, that none who hold the Popes *infallibility* in cauſes of faith for their *foundation*, (that is, none of the preſent Romane Church) either doth, or can beleeve any one doctrine of faith, w^ch^ they profeſſe: For ſeeing the beleefe of all other points relyes upō this, ſo that they beleeve thē, becauſe they firſt beleeve this, it followeth by that true rule of the Philoſopher[i], *Propter quod unumquodq́, illud magis*; that they doe more firmely and certainly beleeve this, which is the *foundation*, than they doe, or can beleeve any other doctrine; I ſay not *Tranſubſtantiation*, or *Purgatory*, but more thā that Article of their *Creed, that Chriſt is God*, or that there is a God, or any the like, which is builded upon this *foundatiō*. And ſeeing we have cleerly demonſtrated that *foundation* to bee, not onely untrue, but hereticall; and therefore ſuch as cannot be apprehended by faith, it being no true object of faith; it doth evidently hence enſue, that they *neither doe, nor can beleeve any one doctrine, poſition or point of faith*. Impoſſible it is, that the rooſe ſhould bee more firme than the *foundation* which ſupports the roof; or the concluſion more certaine unto us than thoſe premiſſes which cauſe us to aſſent, and make us certaine of the concluſion: That one fundamentall uncertainty, & contrariety to the faith, which is vertually in all the reſt, breeds the like uncertainty, and contrariety to faith, in them all; and, like a Radicall poyſon, ſpreads it ſelfe into the whole body of their religion, infecting every arme, branch, and twigge of their doctrine, and faith; whatſoever errour or hereſie they maintaine, (and thoſe are not a few) thoſe they neither doe, nor can beleeve, becauſe they are no objects of faith, whatſoever truths they maintaine, (and no doubt they doe many) thoſe they thinke they doe, and they might doe, but indeed they doe not beleeve, becauſe they hold them for that reaſon, and upon that *foundation* which is contrary to faith, and which overthroweth the faith: For to hold or profeſſe that Chriſt is God, or that there is a God, *eo nomine*, becauſe the Devill, or Antichriſt, or a fallible man teſtifieth it unto us, is not truly to beleeve, but to overthrow the faith.

28. This may be further cleared by returning to our example of *Vigilius*. If, becauſe the Pope judicially defineth a doctrine of faith, they doe therefore beleeve it, then muſt they beleeve Neſtorianiſme to be the truth, and Chriſt not to bee God, becauſe Pope *Vigilius*, by his judiciall and *Apoſtolicall* ſentence, hath decreed this, in decreeing that the *three Chapters*, are to be defended: If they beleeve not this, then can they beleeve nothing at all,

h *Sup. nu.* 19.

i *Ariſt. lib.* 1. *demon. ca.* 2.

eo

eo nomine, becauſe the Pope hath defined it; and then the *foundation* of their faith being aboliſhed, their whole faith, together with it, muſt needs be aboliſhed alſo. Againe, if becauſe the Pope defineth a doctrine, they doe therefore beleeve it; then ſeeing Pope *Caleſtine*, with the Epheſine, and Pope *Leo*, with the *Chalcedon* Councell, decreed Neſtorianiſme to be hereſie, they, by the ſtrength of their fundamental poſitiõ of the Popes *infallibility*, muſt, at one and the ſame time, beleeve, both Neſtorianiſme to be truth, as Pope *Vigilius* defined, and Neſtorianiſme to be hereſie, as Pope *Caleſtine* and *Leo* defined; and ſo they muſt either beleeve two contradictories to be both true, yea, to bee truths of the Catholike faith, which, to beleeve, is impoſſible; or elſe they muſt beleeve, that it is impoſſible to beleeve, either the one or the other, *eo nomine*, becauſe the Pope hath defined it, and ſo beleeve it to bee impoſſible to beleeve that, which is the *foundation* of their whole faith. Neither is this true onely in other points, but even in this very *foundation* it ſelfe: for the fift Councell, which decreed the Cathedrall and *Apoſtolicall* ſentence in the cauſe of the *Three Chapters*, to be heretically, was approved by the decrees of Pope *Gregory*, *Agatho*, and the reſt, unto *Leo* the tenth. If then they beleeve a doctrine to be true, becauſe the Pope hath defined it, then muſt they beleeve the Popes *Cathedral* ſentence in a cauſe of faith, to bee, not onely fallible, but hereticall; and ſo beleeve, that upon this fallible and hereticall *foundation*, they can build no doctrine of faith, nor hold thereupon any thing with certainty of faith: So, if the Pope in defining ſuch cauſes be *fallible*, then, for this cauſe, can they have no faith, nor beleeve ought with certainty of faith, ſeeing all relies upon a *fallible foundation*. If the Pope, in defining ſuch cauſes, be *infallible*, then alſo can they have no faith, ſeeing, by the infallble decrees of Pope *Gregory*, *Agatho*, and the reſt unto *Leo* the tenth, the Popes Cathedrall ſentence in a cauſe of faith, may bee hereticall, as this of Pope *Vigilius*, by their judgement, was: So, whether the Pope in ſuch cauſes, be *fallible*, or *infallible*, it infallibly followeth upon either, that none who builds his faith upon that *foundation*, that is, none who are members of their preſent Romane Church, can beleeve, or hold with certainty of faith, any doctrine whatſoever, which he profeſſeth to beleeve.

29. Here I cannot chuſe, but, to the unſpeakeable comfort of all true beleevers, obſerve a wonderfull difference betwixt us, and them, ariſing from that diverſitie of the *foundation*, which they and we hold; their *foundation* being not onely uncertaine, but *hereticall* and Antichriſtian, poyſoneth all which they build thereon; it being vertually in them all, makes them all, like it ſelfe, uncertaine, hereticall, and Antichriſtian; and ſo thoſe very doctrines, which, in themſelves, are moſt certaine, and orthodoxall, by the uncertainty of that ground, upon which, and for which

which they are beleeved, are overthrowne; with us, and all Catholikes it fals out otherwiſe. Though ſuch happen to erre in ſome one, or moe doctrines of faith, (ſay, in *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Purgatory*, or, as *Cyprian* did, in *Rebaptization*) yet ſeeing they hold thoſe errors, becauſe they thinke them to be taught in the Scriptures, and Word of God, on which alone their faith relyeth; moſt firmely, and undoubtedly beleeving whatſoever is taught therein; (among which things are the contrary doctrines to Tranſubſtantiatiõ, Purgatory, & Rebaptization:) ſuch, I ſay, even while they doe thus erre in their Explicite profeſſion, doe truly, though *implicitè*, by conſequent, and *in radice*, or *fundamento*, beleeve, and that moſt firmely, the quite contrary to thoſe errours, which they doe outwardly profeſſe, and think they doe, but indeed doe not beleeve. The vertue and ſtrength of that fundamentall truth, which they indeed and truly beleeve, overcommeth all their errours, which in very deed they doe not, though they thinke they doe beleeve, whereas, in very truth, they beleeve the quite contrary. And this golden *foundation* in Chriſt, which ſuch men, though erring in ſome points, doe conſtantly hold, ſhall more prevaile to their ſalvation, than the Hay and Stubble of thoſe errours, which ignorantly, but not pertinaciouſly, they build thereon, can prevaile to their deſtruction: and therefore if ſuch a man happen to die, without explicite notice, and repentance of thoſe errours in particular, (as the ſaying of Saint *Auſten*[k], that what faults Saint *Cyprian* had contracted by humane imbecillity, the ſame, by his glorious Martyrdome, was waſhed away, perſwades mee that *Cyprian* did: and as of *Irene*, *Nepos*, *Iuſtine Martyr*, and others, who held the errour of the Chiliaſts, I thinke none makes doubt:) it is not to be doubted, but the abundance of this mans faith and love unto Chriſt, to whom in the *foundation* hee moſt firmely adhereth, ſhall worke the like effect in him, as did the blood of martyrdome in Saint *Cypran*: For the baptiſme of martyrdome waſheth away ſinne, not becauſe it is a waſhing in blood, but becauſe it teſtifieth the inward waſhing of his heart by faith, and by the purging Spirit of God. This inward waſhing in whomſoever it is found, (and found it is in all who truly beleeve, though in ſome point of faith they erre) it is as forcible and effectuall to ſave *Valentinian*[l], neither baptized with water, nor with blood; and *Nepos*[m], baptized with water, but not with blood, as to ſave *Cyprian*, baptized both with water, and with blood. Such a comfort and happineſſe it is to hold the right and true *foundation* of faith.

k *Lib. 1. de baptiſm. ca. 18.*

l *Ablatus aſcendit, quẽ ſua fides lavit. Amb. Orat. de obitu Valent.*

m *Qui jam ad quietem præceſſit, ait Dionyſ. apud Euſeb. l. 1. ca. 23.*

30. The quite contrary is to be ſeen in them: Though they *explicitè* profeſſe Chriſt to be God, w^ch^ is a moſt *orthodoxall* truth, yet becauſe they hold this, as all other points, upon that *foundation* of the Popes *infallible* judgement in cauſes of faith, and in that *foundation* this is denyed; Pope *Vigilius*, by his *Cathedrall* Conſtitution

ſtitution defining Neſtorianiſme to be truth, and ſo Chriſt not to be God; it muſt needs be confeſſed, that even while they doe *explicitè* profeſſe Chriſt to bee God, they doe *implicitè, in radice*, and *in fundamento*; deny Chriſt to be God: and becauſe, by the Philoſophers rule; they doe more firmely beleeve that *foundation*, than they doe, or can beleeve any doctrine depending thereon; it muſt needs enſue hence, that they doe, and muſt by their doctrine more firmely beleeve the Negative, that Chriſt is not God, which in the *foundation* is decreed, then they doe, or can beleeve the Affirmative, that Chriſt is God, which upon that *foundation* is builded. The truth, which upon that *foundation* they doe *explicitè* profeſſe, cannot poſſibly be ſo ſtrong to ſalvation, as the errour of the *foundation*, upon which they build it, will be to deſtruction: For the fundamentall errour is never amended by any truth ſuperedified and laid thereon, no more than the rotten foundation of an houſe is made ſound by laying upon it rafters of gold or ſilver, but all the truths that are ſuperedified, are ruinated by that fundamentall errour and uncertainty on which they all relye, even as the beames and rafters of gold are ruinated by that rottenneſſe and unſoundneſſe which reſteth in the *foundation*: Or if they ſay, that both the aſſertions (which are directly contradictory) are from that *foundation* deduced, *Cæleſtine* and *Leo* decreeing the one, that Chriſt is God, as *Vigilius* decreed the other, that Chriſt is not God, then doth it inevitably follow, that they can truly beleeve neither the one, nor the other, ſeeing, by beleeving that *foundation*, they muſt equally beleeve them both, which is impoſſible. Such an unhappy, and wretched thing it is, to hold that erroneous, hereticall, and Antichriſtian foundation of faith.

31. My concluſion of this point is this. Seeing we have firſt declared, that all who are members of the preſent Romane Church, doe hold the Popes *Cathedrall infallibility* in cauſes of faith, yea, hold it as the very *foundation* on which all their other doctrines, faith and religion doth relye; and ſeeing wee have next demonſtrated this to be a fundamentall hereſie, and not onely an hereticall, but an Antichriſtian *foundation*, condemned by Scriptures, by generall Councels, by ancient Fathers, and by the conſenting judgement of the whole Catholike Church; that now hence followeth which I propoſed[n] to prove, *that none is, or can bee a member of their preſent Church, but the ſame is convicted and condemned for an heretike*, by Scriptures, generall Councels, Fathers, and by the uniforme conſent of the Catholike Church. An heretike, firſt, in the very *foundation* of his faith, which being Antichriſtian, is hereticall in the higheſt, and worſt degree that may be, razing the true foundation of faith, in regard whereof the myſtery of Antichriſtianiſme farre ſurpaſſeth all the hereſies that ever went before, or ſhall ever follow after it. An heretike, ſecondly, in many particular doctrines depending

[n] *Sup. nu. 6.*

ding on that *Foundation*, among which are the hereſies and blaſphemies of the Neſtorians; all which by the *Cathedrall* conſtitution of *Vigilius*, are decreed to be truths, and by all men to be defended. Laſtly, an heretike vertually and *quoad radicem*, in every doctrine of faith which hee holdeth or profeſſeth, and ſo hereticall therein, that the very holding of Catholike truths becomes unto him hereticall, ſeeing he holds them upon that *Foundation*, which is not only contrary to faith, but which overthroweth the whole faith. *Reward* [o] *Babylon, O ye ſervants of the Lord, as ſhe hath rewarded you, give her double according to her workes, and in the cup that ſhe hath filled to you, fill her the double.*

o Rev. 18.6.

32. From hence there enſueth one other concluſion, w^ch being worthy obſerving, I may not well omit. And this it is, *That in none at all, of their Church, or of the ſame faith with it, there neither is nor can be (ſo long as they remaine ſuch) any piety or holineſſe, either in their life, or in any of their actions:* nor any act which is truly good and acceptable unto God is or can be performed by any of them. For true faith is the *Foundation* and fountaine of all true pietie, and good actions, it being impoſſible, as the Apoſtle teacheth, *without* [p] *faith to pleaſe God:* and, *to the* [q] *unbeleevers all things are impure, even their mindes and conſciences are defiled;* How much more their outward actions, ſpeeches, writings, and thoughts, which all ſpring from the heart. To this purpoſe is that in the Prophet *Haggai* [r], who demandeth of the Prieſts, *If a polluted perſon* (ſuch are all whoſe hearts are not purified [ſ] by faith) *touch any of theſe things, either holy bread, or holy wine, or any holy thing, ſhall it be uncleane? And the Prieſts anſwered and ſaid, It ſhall be unclean.* The pollution of him that toucheth it, pollutes all, even the moſt holy things that are. Then anſwered *Haggai*; and ſaid; *So is this people, and ſo is this Nation before me, ſaith the Lord. So are all the workes of their hands, and that which they offer is uncleane.* The ſame agreeth to thoſe of whom we intreat. The infidelity of their hearts, pollutes all their actions, ſeeme they never ſo holy: their almes-deedes and workes of charity, their righteouſneſſe, and workes of juſtice, their faſtings, continency, and workes of temperance, their prayers, ſacraments, ſacrifices, and workes of pietie: the fountaine being poyſoned with *infidelity*, and want of true faith, all the waters, every river, and little brooke derived from it, carieth the ſame infection in it, which it tooke at the ſpring. Saint *Auſten* is plentifull in this point: *Where the faith,* faith he [t], *is fained or unſound, non poteſt ex ea bona vita exiſtere, there can no good life be or ariſe from it.* In another place [u] hee ſheweth, *that even to keepe ones ſelfe chaſt or continent, and yet to doe this without faith, is a ſinne,* and that thereby, *non peccata toleruntur, ſed alijs peccatis alia peccata vincuntur, ſinnes are not expelled, but one ſinne (of intemperancy) is overcome by another ſinne, (of continency wanting faith).* To omit many the like, heare what he ſaith to the Manichees, boaſting, as they [x] of the Romane Church doe, that they fulfilled

p Heb. 11.6.
q Tit. 1.15.
r Ca. 2. 14.15.
ſ Act. 15.9.
t Lib. 5. cont. Fauſt. ca. 11.
u Lib. 1. de Nup. & Conc. ca. 30.
x Poteſt homo facere plus quã Deus præcipit, ſed non multo magis poteſt implere præceptum. Bell. lib. 4. de Iuſtif. ca. 13. §. Accedant, & Catholici omnes docent, legem dei juſtis hominibus eſſe abſolutè poſſibilem, lib. eod. ca. 10 §. Porro.

y Auſt. lib. 5. contra Fauſt. ca. 5.

fulfilled the Law. *Why* y *doe ye boaſt ſo much of fulfilling the Law, and commandements of God? Quid illa prodeſſent omnia ubi non eſt fides vera, etiamſi vere implerentur à vobis? what could all the commandements profit you, who have not a true faith, though ye did truly fulfill them all?* Thus and much more Saint *Auſten.* Seeing then we have proved, their faith to be not onely unſound but hereticall and Antichriſtian, (worſe then which, the faith of the Manichees could not be:) impoſſible it is that from ſuch a faith, either true vertue, or any godly act ſhould ever ariſe. The beſt that can be ſaid of thoſe which they call good workes, is that which

z In lib. Inſt. divin. ca. 6,

Lactantius ſaith z of the works of the Ethnikes, which like theirs, *quoad ſubſtantiam operis, were good. Vmbra eſt & imago juſtitiæ, quam illi juſtitiam putaverunt: It is but a ſhadow and ſhew of juſtice, which they thinke to be juſtice. Omnis* a *doctrina & virtus eorum ſine capite eſt, all the knowledge and vertue which they have, wanteth the head of true knowledge and vertue:* It wanteth true faith in Chriſt, which is the head of all knowledge, and vertue. This head whoſoever wanteth, *Non dubium eſt, quin impius ſit, omneſq; virtutes ejus in illa mortifera via reperiantur, quæ eſt tota tenebrarum, theres no doubt to be made, but ſuch an one is impious, and all the vertues which hee thinkes he hath, are mortiferous and deadly.*

a Lib. eod. ca. 9.

33. Where againe I cannot but obſerve to the comfort of all true beleevers, another exceeding difference betwixt us and them, even in theſe matters concerning life, and good workes: whatſoever things are either in themſelves good, or being of themſelves indifferent, are by the lawfull authority either of civill, or eccleſiaſticall governours, commanded, we in doing any of thoſe things, and ſhewing our willing obedience thereunto, performe an act not onely lawfull, but laudable and acceptable unto God. For in doing any of theſe, we doe *vertually* performe obedience unto Chriſt, who by them commandeth the doing of all ſuch things: and in our religious performing of them, we hold firme that holy *foundation*, not onely of faith, but of good workes, which the ſcriptures teach. Neither onely are ſuch workes acceptable unto God, but even thoſe acts alſo which are wicked and ungodly, being committed by ſuch as doe truly beleeve, though they be as heinous as was the crime of *David*, or the abjuration of *Peter*, even thoſe, I ſay, by the ſtrength and vertue of that *foundation*, if one doe rightly hold and beleeve it, are ſo covered b, put c away and forgotten, that God d ſeeth none iniquity in *Iacob*, nor tranſgreſſion in *Iſrael*. Such, ſo infinite is the goodneſſe, and ſo ſoveraigne is the vertue which is in holding the true *foundation* of faith. The contrary of all this falleth out unto them, of the preſent Romane Church. For not onely their ſinnes are made more ſinfull unto them, there being no mantle to cover, or hide them from the eyes of God, and ſhield them from his vengeance, but even their beſt and moſt holy actions which they doe, or can performe, though they ſhould doe

b Peccatum tectum eſt. Pſal. 32. 1.
c Iſa. 43. 25.
d Numb. 23. 21.

doe nothing but ſing hymnes with *David*, or feed Chriſts flock with *Peter*, or give their goods to the poore, and their bodies to be burned for Chriſt, even theſe, I ſay, are ſo tainted with the venome of that *Apoſtaticall foundation*, that being of themſelves holy actions, yet unto them they are turned into ſinne, and become pernicious and mortiferous. For whatſoever act being in it ſelfe either good or indifferent, any of their Church (except onely the Pope himſelfe, who is a member tranſcendent) doth performe, becauſe they doe it in obedience unto him, whoſe ſupreme authority they make the *foundation*, not onely of their faith, but of all good actions: in doing any ſuch act, there is a *vertuall* and *implicit* obedience to Antichriſt, an acknowledgement of his ſupreme power to teach and command what is to be done; a receiving his marke, either in their hand or forehead: ſo that every ſuch act, is not onely impious, but even Antichriſtian, and containeth in it a vertuall and implicit renouncing of the whole faith. In regard whereof none can ever ſufficiently, I ſay, not commend, but admire the zeale of *Luther*: who though he was ſo earneſt to have the Communion in both kinds, contrarie to the doctrine and cuſtome of the Romane Church, *yet withall he* [e] *profeſſed that, if the Pope as Pope ſhould command it to be received in both kinds, he then would receive it not in both, but in one kind onely.* Bleſſed *Luther*! it was never thy meaning either to receive it, onely in one, or to deny it to be neceſſary for Gods Church and people to receive it in both kindes. Thou kneweſt right well, that *Bibite ex hoc omnes*, was Chriſts owne ordinance, with which none might diſpenſe; Thou for defence of this truth among many, was ſet up as a ſigne of contradiction unto them, and as a marke at which they directed all their darts of malicious and malignant reproaches. Farre was it from thee to relent one hare-bredth in this truth. But whereas *they* [f] *taught the uſe of the Cup to be indifferent and arbitrarie*; ſuch as the Church (that is, the Pope) might either allow, or take away, as he ſhould thinke fit: upon this ſuppoſall and no otherwiſe, didſt thou in thine ardent zeale to Chriſt, and deteſtation of Antichriſt, ſay, that were the uſe of both or one kinde onely, a thing indeed indifferent, as they taught it to be, if the Pope as Pope ſhould command the receiving in both kindes; thou wouldſt not then receive it ſo, leſt whilſt thou might ſeeme to obey Chriſt commanding that, but yet (upon their ſuppoſall) as a thing indifferent, thou ſhouldeſt certainly performe obedience to Antichriſt, by his authoritie limiting, and reſtraining that indifferency, unto both kindes, as now by his authority hee reſtraines it unto one. The ſumme is this, *To doe any act whether in it ſelfe good, or indifferent, but commanded to be done by the Pope as Pope, to pray, to preach, to receive the Sacraments, yea but to lift your eyes, or hold up your finger, or ſay your Pater noſter, or your Ave Maria, or weare a bead, a medell, a lace, or my garment white, or blacke, or uſe any croſsing, either at Baptiſme, or*

e *Kemnit. Exa. Conc. Trid. 1. Tract. de communi. ſub utraq; ſpecie. pa. 136.*

f *Conc. Conſtant. Seſſ. 13. Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 22. in decreto ſuper petit. de conceſſione calicis Bell. lib. 4. de Euchar. ca. 28.*

any other time, to do any one of these, or any the like, *eo nomine, because the Pope, as Pope, teacheth that they are to be done, or commands the doing of them, is in very deed a yeelding one selfe to be a vassall of Antichrist, a receiving the marke of the beast, and a vertuall or implicit deniall of the faith in Christ.* So extremly venemous is that poison which lyeth in the root of that fundamentall heresie which they have laid as the very rocke and *Foundation* of their faith.

34. Hitherto we have examined the former *position* of *Baronius* which concerned *Heresie*. His other concerning *Schisme*, is this: *That they who dissented from Pope Vigilius when hee decreed that the Three Chapters ought to be defended, were Schismatikes.* A most strange assertion: that the whole Catholike Church should bee schismaticall, for they all dissented from *Vigilius* in this cause; that Catholikes should all at once become Schismatikes, yea and that also for the very defence of the Catholike faith. I oppose to this, another and true assertion, *That not onely Pope Vigilius when he defended the Three Chapters, and forsooke communion with the condemners of them, was a Schismatike himselfe, and chiefe of the Schisme, but that all who as yet defend Vigilius, that is, who maintaine the Popes Cathedrall infallibility in causes of faith, and forsake communion with those that condemne it, that those all are; and that for this very cause, Schismatikes, and the Pope, the ringleader in the Schisme.*

g Esse schismatici convicti sunt, qui diversam à Romano Pontifice, bis decernendis, sententiam sectati essent. Bar. an. 547. nn. 30.

35. For the manifesting whereof, certaine it is, that after Pope *Vigilius* had so solemnly, and judicially by his *Apostolicall* authority defined, that the *Three Chapters* ought to be defended, there was a great rent and Schisme in the Church, either part separating it selfe from the other, and forsaking communion with the other. First, the holy Councell, and they who tooke part with it, anathematized [h] the defenders of those Chapters, thereby (as themselves expound it) declaring their opposites to be separated [i] from God, and therefore from the society of the church of God. On the other side, Pope *Vigilius* & they who were on his part, were so averse from the others, that they would rather endure disgrace, yea banishment as *Baronius* [k] sheweth, then communicate with their opposites. But I shal not need to stay in proving that there was a rent and schisme at this time betweene the defenders & condemners of those chapters. *Baronius* professeth it, saying [l], *The whole Church was then schismate dilacerata, torn asunder by a schisme.* Againe [m], *After the end of the Councell there arose a greater war then was before. Catholikes* (so he falsly calls both parts) *being then divided among themselves, some adhering to the Councell, others holding with Vigilius and his Constitution.* Againe, *Many* [n] *relying upon the authority of Vigilius, did not receive the fift Synod, atq; à contraria illis sentientibus sese diviserunt, and separated or divided themselves frõ those who thought the contrary:* Such were the *Italian, Africane, Illirian*, & other neighbour Bishops. So *Baronius:*

h Coll. 8. talis anathema sit. sæpe ibid.
i Nihil aliud significat anathema, nisi à Deo separationem. Coll. 5. pa. 552. b.
k An. 553. nu. 221.
l Ibid.
m An. eodem 553. nu. 230.
n An. eodem nu. 229.

ronius: truly profeſſing a ſchiſme to have bin then in the Church; and Pope *Vigilius* to have beene the leader of the one part.

36. But whether of theſe two parts were Schiſmatickes? As the name of hereſie, though it bee common to any opinion, whereof one makes choice, whether it be true or falſe, (in which ſenſe *Conſtantine* the great, called [o] the true faith, *Catholicam & ſanctiſsimam hæreſim*) yet in the ordinarie uſe it is now applied only to the choice of ſuch opinions, as are repugnāt to the faith: So the name of Schiſme though it import any ſciſſure or renting of one from another, yet now by the vulgar uſe of Divines, it is appropriated onely to ſuch a rent or diviſion as is made for an unjuſt cauſe, and from thoſe, to whom, hee or they who are ſeparated, ought to unite themſelves & hold communion with them. This, whoſoever doe, whether they bee moe, or fewer then thoſe from whom they ſeparate themſelves, they are truly and properly to bee termed Schiſmatikes, and factious. For it is neither multitude, nor paucitie, nor the holding with, or againſt any viſible head, or governour whatſoever, nor the bare act of ſeparating ones ſelfe from others; but only the cauſe, for which the ſeparation is made, which maketh a Schiſme or faction, and truly denounceth one to be factious, or a Schiſmatike. If *Elijah* ſeparate himſelfe from the foure hundreth *Baalites* and the whole kingdome of *Iſrael*, becauſe they are Idolaters; and they ſever themſelves from him becauſe he wil not worſhip *Baal*, as they did; If the three children for the like cauſe, ſeparate themſelves from all the Idolatrous Babylonians, in ſeparation they are both like, but in the cauſe being moſt unlike, the *Baalites* onely, and not *Elijah*, and the Babylonians only, and not the three children, are Schiſmatikes. Now becauſe every one is bound to unite himſelfe to the Catholike and *orthodoxall* Church, and hold communion with them in faith, hence it is that, as out of *Auſtine* [h] *Stapleton* rightly obſerves [i], *Tota ratio Schiſmatis*, the very eſſence of a Schiſme conſiſts in the ſeparating from the Church, I ſay from the true & *orthodoxall* Church, for as Saint *Auguſtine* in the ſame place teacheth, whoſoever diſſents from the Scriptures, and ſo from the true faith, though they be ſpred throughout the whole world, yet ſuch are not in the (ſound) Church, much leſſe are they the Church. And therefore from them, be they never ſo many, never ſo eminent, one may, and muſt ſeparate himſelfe. But if any ſever himſelfe from the *orthodoxall* Church, or, to ſpeake in *Stapletons* words, *ſi-renuit operari in ratione fidei ut pars eccleſia catholica, if he will not cooperate or joyne together in maintaining the faith, as a member of the Catholike or orthodoxall Church, Schiſmaticus hoc ipſo eſt, hee is for this very cauſe a Schiſmatike.*

o *Epiſt. ad Creſtum apud Euſeb. lib. 10. ca. 5.*

h *Lib. de unit. Eccl. ca. 4.*

i *Lib. 6. doct. princ. ca. 7. §. Iſtud.*

k *Lib. 10. ca. 7. §. Nempe.*

37. Apply now this to *Vigilius* and the fift generall Councell, and the caſe will be cleare. The onely cauſe of ſeparation on the Councels part, was, for that *Vigilius* with all his adhe-

sents were Heretikes, convicted, condemned; and accurſed for ſuch, by that true ſentence, and judgement of the fift generall Councell, which was conſonant both to Scriptures, Fathers, and the foure former generall Councels, and approved by all ſucceeding generall Councels, Popes, and Biſhops, that is, by the judgement of the whole Catholike Church, for more then fifteene hundreth yeares together. A cauſe not onely moſt juſt, but commanded by the holy Apoſtle[1], *Shun him that is an heretick, after once or twice admonition*; much more after publike conviction and condemnation, by the upright judgement of the whole Catholike Church. On the other ſide, *Vigilius* and his Faction ſeparated themſelves from the Councell, and all that tooke part with it, for this onely reaſon, becauſe they were Catholikes; becauſe they embraced and conſtantly defended the Catholike faith; becauſe he wold not cooperate (as *Stapleton* ſpeaketh) with them, to maintaine the true Catholike faith, and ſo on their part, there was that which eſſentially made them Schiſmatickes. *Baronius* in ſaying that thoſe who then diſſented from *Vigilius*, were Schiſmatickes, ſpeakes ſutably to all his former aſſertions; For in ſaying this, he in effect ſaith, that Catholikes to avoid a Schiſme, ſhould have turned Heretickes, ſhould have embraced Neſtorianiſme, and ſo have renounced and condemned the whole Catholike faith, as *Vigilius* then did. Had they ſo done, they ſhould have been no Schiſmatikes with *Baronius*: But now for not condemning the Catholike faith with *Vigilius*, they muſt all be condemned by the Cardinall, for Schiſmatickes.

[1] Tit. 3. 10.

38. For the very ſame reaſon, the whole preſent Romane Church are Schiſmatickes at this day; and not the Reformed Churches from whom they ſeparate themſelves. For the cauſe of ſeparation on their part, is the ſame for which *Vigilius* and his ſchiſmaticall faction ſeparated themſelves from the fift Councell, and the Catholikes of thoſe times who all tooke part with it, even becauſe wee refuſe to embrace the Popes *Cathedrall* ſentence in cauſes of faith, as the fift Councell refuſed that of *Vigilius*. The cauſe on our part is the ſame which the fift Councell then had, for that they defend the Popes heretical *conſtitution*: nay not onely that of *Vigilius* (which yet were cauſe enough) but many other like unto that, and eſpecially that one of *Leo* the tenth with his Laterane Councell, wherby *Supremacie* and with it *Infallibilitie* of judgement is given unto the Pope in all his decrees of faith: In which one *Cathedrall* decree (condemned for hereticall by the fift Councell, and conſtant judgement both of precedent and ſubſequent Councells, as before we have declared) not onely innumerable hereſies ſuch as none yet doth dreame of, are included, but by the venom and poyſon of that one fundamentall hereſie, not only all the other doctrines are corrupted, but the very *foundation* of faith is utterly overthrowne

throwne. Let them boaſt of multitudes, and univerſalitie never ſo much, (which at this day is but a vaine brag) ſay they were far more, even foure hundreth to one *Luther*, or the whole kingdome of *Babilon* to the two witneſſes of God; yet ſeeing it is the cauſe which makes a ſchiſmaticke; & the cauſe of ſeparation on their part is moſt unjuſt, but on ours moſt warrantable & holy, for that they will not cooperate with us, in upholding the ancient and Catholike faith, that eſpecially of the fift Councell, condemning and accurſing the Cathedrall ſentence of Pope *Vigilius*, as hereticall, & all that defend it, as Heretickes, it evidently followeth, that they are the only, & eſſentially ſchiſmatickes, at this time, and in this great rent of the Church,

39. Whence againe doth enſue another Concluſion of no ſmall importance. For it is a ruled caſe among them, ſuch as *Bellarmine* [m] avoucheth to be proved both by Scriptures, by Fathers, by pontificall decrees, and ſound reaſon, *that no ſchiſmatickes are in the Church, or of the Church*, Now becauſe out of [n] the Church there is no ſalvation, it nearly concernes them, to bethinke themſelves ſeriouſly what hope there is or can be unto them, who being, (as wee have proved) ſchiſmatickes, are for this cauſe by their owne doctrine, utterly excluded from the Church. But I will proceed no further in this matter, wherein I have ſtayed much longer then I intended, yet my hope is, that I have now abundantly cleared againſt *Baronius*, not onely, That one may diſſent in faith, and bee diſioyned in communion from the Pope, & yet neither be Heretickes nor Schiſmatickes: but, That none can now conſent in faith, and hold communion with the Pope, but for that very cauſe he is by the judgement of the Catholike Church, both an hereticke and a ſchiſmaticke.

m *Lib. de Eccleſ. milit. ca. 5.*

n *Extra quam (Eccleſiam) nullus omnino ſalvatur. Conc. Lateran. ca. 1.*

CHAP. XIIII.

The ſecond Exception of Baronius, *excuſing* Vigilius *from hereſie*, for that he often profeſſeth to hold the Coſicell of *Chalcedon*, and the faith thereof, refuted.

1.  Is ſecond excuſe for *Vigilius* is taken from that profeſſion which both other defenders of the *three Chapters*, and *Vigilius* himſelfe often maketh in his *Conſtitution*, that hee holdes the faith of the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and did all for the ſafety of that Councell. *Both parties* ſaith *Baronius* [a], *as well the defenders as the condemners of thoſe three Chapters did teſtifie*, that they deſired nothing more, *quam conſultum eſſe catholica fidei, probatæ à S. Concilio Chalcedonenſi, then to provide that the Catholike faith decreed at Chalcedon might be ſafe*. Againe [b] *liquet omnes*, it is manifeſt that all

a *An. 547. nu. 47.*

b *An. 546. nu. 53.*

all Catholikes (in defence of the three Chapters) at once contradicted this noveltie, (set downe in the Emperors Edict for condemning those chapters) *vindicesque se Concilij Chalcedonensis exhibuisse, and shewed themselves to bee defenders of the Councell of Chalcedon*, Of *Vigilius* in particular, hee not so little as fortie times ingeminates this: *Vigilius* [c] writ these things, *pro defensione & integritate Synodi Chalcedonensis, for the defence and safety of the Councell at Chalcedon.* Vigilius [d] *writ his constitution for no other* cause (as by it is evident) *but to the end that all things which were defined by the Councell at Chalcedon, firma consisterent, might remaine firme and by no meanes be infringed.* Againe [e], *All that* Vigilius *or the rest did in this cause, did tend hereunto, ut consultum esset dignitati & authoritati Synodi Chalcedonensis, that the dignity and authoritie of the Councell at Chalcedon might be kept safe and sound*, Thus *Baronius*.

c *An.* 553. *nu.* 197.

d *Ibid. nu.* 47.

e *Ibid. nu.* 231.

2. The writings of those who defended *those Chapters* declare the same. *Victor* in plaine termes affirmeth [f], the *three Chapters to have been approved and judged orthodox all by the Councell of Chalcedon, and the condemning of them, to bee the condemning of that Councell; and that for this cause, he refused to condemne them, least in so doing he should condemne the Councell of Chalcedon.* The like hee witnesseth [g] of *Facundus*: whose owne words set downe by *Baronius* [h] shew, *that hee disliked the condemners of those three Chapters, because by condemning them, Synodum improbarent, they condemned the Councell of Chalcedon.* But none shewes the like love to that Councell, and care for it as doth Pope *Vigilius* in his *Constitution, we decree* saith he [i], *That the judgement of the Fathers at Chalcedon, shall be kept inviolable in all things, and particularly in this, touching the Epistle of Ibas: wee dare not call into question their judgement:* their judgement *in omnibus conservantes, we keepe in all things.* Againe [k], *we permit no man to innovate either by additiõ, or detraction, or alteration, any thing which is ordained & set down by the Councell at Chalcedon.* Againe [l], *Behold, O Emperor, it is more cleare then the light, that we have alwayes beene desirous to reverence the foure Councels, and that all things might remaine inviolable which by them are defined and judged.* This, and much more to the like purpose saith *Vigilius*: Who now reading these things in his *Cõstitution*, and seeing him so fervent and zealous for the Councell at *Chalcedon*, and the faith therein declared, would not thinke, nay proclame *Vigilius* to be a most sound Catholike, an utter enemie to *Nestorianisme*, as that holy Councell at *Chalcedon* was? Or who would not applaud *Baronius* for his devise to defend and excuse *Vigilius* from heresie, because he was so earnest for the Councell of *Chalcedon* and the faith declared therein, which none can embrace, and be guiltie of *Nestorianisme*? This is his plea for *Vigilius*.

f *In Chron. an.* 2. *post Coss. Basil.*

g *An.* 10. *post Coss. Basily.*

h *An.* 545. *nu.* 28.

i *Apud Bar. an.* 553. *nu.* 196.

k *Ibid. nu.* 197.

l *Ibid. nu.* 207.

3. For answer whereunto, I am ashamed that *Baronius*, a Cardinall, and man of rare knowledge, as hee is supposed, should shew

ſhew himſelfe ſo inconſiderate in this cauſe, as to ſeeke to excuſe or defend *Vigilius*, by alledging the name, credit, or authoritie of the Councell of *Chalcedon*. For even that alone, if there were nothing elſe, puls upon him that juſt *Anathema* denounced by the fift Councell, who thus decree, *Woe* [m] *anathematize the defenders of theſe Three Chapters, and thoſe who have written, or doe write for them, or who doe defend, or indeavour to defend the impiety of them, nomine ſanctorum Patrum, aut ſancti Chalcedonenſis Concilij; by the name of the holy fathers, or of the Councell at Chalcedon.* The more then that either *Vigilius* pretends that Councell for defence of the *Three Chapters*, or, that *Baronius* pretends it for the defence of *Vigilius*, the more they are ſtill involved in the Councels *Anathema*: and no marvell, for by alledging that Councell as a patrone of thoſe *Three Chapters*, they ſlander that moſt holy Councell, and all that approve it, that is, the whole Catholike Church to be hereticall, and patrons of the moſt blaſphemous, and condemned hereſie of *Neſtorius*.

m *Coll.8.pa.586.b. & 588.a.*

4. Let this paſſe: Is this reaſon, thinke you, of *Baronius* of any force to excuſe *Vigilius*; hee profeſſeth to defend the Councell of *Chalcedon*, therefore he is not an heretike? Truly of none at all; for who knoweth not that heretikes are as forward in chalenging to themſelves the names and authority of ancient Councels, and in profeſſing to defend the ſame faith and doctrine which they taught. Take a view but of three or foure examples, and then you will pitty *Baronius* for this ſo weake and ſilly excuſe for *Vigilius*.

5. In the *Epheſine Latrocinie* there came [n] certaine *Eutycheans* heretikes, to the number of 35. who being juſtly excommunicated by that holy Biſhop *Flavianus*, deſired to bee reſtored to the cõmunion of the Church: *Dioſcorus* & his Synod willed them to make a profeſſion of their faith; they did ſo; & their confeſſiõ was this, *Sic ſapimus, ſicut* 318. *Patres in Nicea ſanxerunt, & ſicut hic congregata ſancta Synodus confirmarunt; wee beleeve as the Nicene Fathers decreed, and the (former) holy Synod at Epheſus confirmed, nor did we ever beleeve, or thinke otherwiſe than thoſe holy Councels decreed:* wee beleeve as S. *Athanaſius*, S. *Cyrill*, S. *Gregory*, & *omnes Catholici Epiſcopi, and as all Catholike Biſhops have beleeved; and we accurſe all that beleeve otherwiſe.* Thus profeſſed thoſe *Eutycheans* heretikes, and upon this profeſſion they were by *Dioſcorus* and his Synod reſtored to the communion of the Church; yea, which is more, that ſame *Latrocinie* or hereticall Synod at *Epheſus*, profeſſing [o] the former Councels to be, *tutelam noſtræ Catholicæ fidei, the ſtay and prop of their Catholike faith*, (ſo they call their hereſie) commanded the Nicene Creed, which was confirmed in the holy *Epheſine* Councell, to bee read before them; and the teſtimonies of many holy Fathers [p] conſenting thereunto, *Peter*, *Athanaſius*, *Fœlix*, *Iulius*, *Cyprian*, and others, together with the decree of the Epheſine Councell, *Nulli licere proferre, vel conſcribere,* [q]

n *Act. Concil. Eph. recitat. in Conc. Chal. Act. 1. pa. 45.*

o *Ibid. pa. 46.*

p *Ibid. pa. 47.*

q *Ibid. pa. 56.*

ſcribere, vel componere aliam fidem præter eam; that it ſhould not be lawfull for any to utter, write, or compoſe any other faith, or Creed, but that which was decreed at Nice. After all theſe read before them, *Dioſcorus* ſaid, *Exiſtimo omnibus placere, I thinke that this faith decreed at Nice, and confirmed at Epheſus, is approved by us all; for we may not either retract or make doubt of what they have done: and let every man ſay his judgement hereof:* Then ſaid *Thalaſſius*, I thinke the ſame, *& qui contraria eis ſapiunt, abominor; and I abhorre all who thinke the contrary. Iohn* of *Sebaſtia*, I deteſt all hereſies, *& colo hanc ſolam fidem, and embrace this faith onely which was decreed at Nice. Stephanus, If any beleeve otherwiſe than the Nicene Fathers decreed, let him be accurſed, becauſe this is the true and Catholike faith.* and the whole Councell ſaid, *Omnes ſumus ejuſdem fidei, we are all of the ſame faith, which the Nicene Fathers decreed.* Thus profeſſed that whole *Epheſine Latrocinie* conſiſting of 128 Biſhops, they all ſaid, they held the Nicene faith, and none but that; accurſing all that received not that: while yet at that very time when they thus profeſſed, they were moſt damnable heretikes, and conſpired together to aboliſh for ever the holy *Nicene* faith: They being *Eutycheans*, learned to make ſuch a diſſembling profeſſion of *Eutyches* himſelfe, who deliveredup to that Synod [f] a confeſſion of his faith, bemoaning, that he was perſecuted, becauſe he would not deny the Nicene faith, nor beleeve otherwiſe then thoſe holy fathers had decreed; and the Epheſine Councell had confirmed; and who having repeated *verbatim* the Nicene Creed, addeth this, *Thus was I taught by my progenitors, thus have I beleeved, in this faith was I borne, in this faith was I baptized, and ſigned, (with the Croſſe) in this faith was I conſecrated, in this faith have I lived to this day, and in this faith doe I deſire to dye:* And this confeſſion doe I make, *atteſtante mihi tam Deo, quam veſtra ſanctitate; both God and this holy Councell being my witneſſe hereof.* Thus *Eutyches*; of whom (notwithſtanding this ſo holy a profeſſion) and all his partakers, their ſecond Nicene Councel truly ſaith [g], *Eutiches, Dioſcorus, and the heretikes of that braune approved the Nicene faith, confirmed in the holy Councell at Epheſus, ſed tamen hæretici permanſerunt, yet for all that they remained heretikes.*

r *Ibid. pa. 57.*

f *Conciliab. Epheſ. in Act. Conc. Chal. Act. 1. pa. 11.*

g *Act. 6. pa. 561.*

6. What can the Cardinall, or any of his friends oppoſe to this Example? If *Vigilius* be no heretike, becauſe hee profeſſeth to hold the faith of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, then neither *Dioſcorus*, nor the *Eutycheans*, nor *Eutyches* himſelfe, is an heretike, becauſe they all with as great earneſtneſſe profeſſed to keepe inviolable the Councels at *Nice*, and *Epheſus*, & the Catholike faith explaned in them, accurſing all who beleeve the contrary thereunto: If notwithſtanding this ſo reſolute and earneſt profeſſion, *Dioſcorus* & the *Eutycheans*, with that *Epheſine* cõſpiracy, were heretikes, & *Eutyches* himſelf an archheretike, as they al undoubtedly were; for even while they thus profeſſed, they all denied [u] two natures to remaine in Chriſt, after the union, as the very acts of that

u *Confiteor ex duabus naturis fuiſſe Dominum ante adunationem, poſt vero adunationem unam naturam confiteor, Dixit Eutyches: ſancta Synodus dixit, conſentimus. Act. Conc. Epheſ. in Act. Conc. Chal. Act. 1. pa. 28. b.*

that *Latrocinie* doe expreſly declare; then was it a very ſilly reaſon of *Baronius*, to conclude, that *Vigilius* was no heretike, becauſe in his decree, for defence of the *Three Chapters*, hee is ſo reſolute to keepe inviolable the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and the faith there decreed.

7. The like may bee ſeene in the *Monothelites*, of whom their ſecond Nicen Synod ſaith [x] thus. *Sergius Biſhop of Conſtantinople, Cyrus Biſhop of Alexandria, Honorius Biſhop of Rome, and all who are called Monothelites, embraced both the Councell of Chalcedon, and the next which followed it* (which is this fift) *and the generall Councels which went before theſe, to wit, the Nicen, Conſtantinopolitane, and Epheſine: verumtamen ut hæretici a Catholica eccleſia dammati ſunt; yet for all this they were condemned for hereticks, by the whole Church*; Why may not the Catholike Church give the like doome of *Vigilius* for defending the *three Chapters*, though hee profeſſe and imbrace all the ſame Councels, and particularly that of *Chalcedon*, as they did?

x *Act. 6. pt. 561.*

8. Perhaps other Hereticks would diſſemble in their profeſſion, but the *Neſtorians* (of which ranke *Vigilius* was) they were men of a better faſhion, they would never profeſſe to hold the decrees and faith of an holy Councell, unleſſe they did ſo indeed. Fie, of all hereticks they were moſt vile in this kinde: Read the acts of their Conventicle held in an Inne at *Epheſus*, during the time of the holy *Epheſine* Councell, and you ſhall ſee, that as by lies, ſlanders and all baſe revilings they ſought to diſgrace *Cyrill*, and all other orthodoxall Biſhops, calumniating them as hereticks, and oppugners of the *Nicen* faith, ſo they boaſted of themſelves, that they forſooth were the onely men who defended and upheld the Councell of Nice and the faith there explaned; Witneſſe beſides their ſecond Nicen [x] Synod, their owne words, and writings, *Neſtorius* himſelfe and others of his ſect, writ [y] thus to the Emperor, *we obeying your Imperiall command, came to Epheſus, and our intent and deſire was, communi omnium calculo ſanctorum Patrum Nicenorum fidem confirmare, to confirme with one conſent the faith of the Nicen Fathers.* In thoſe inſtructions, which they gave to their Legates, they ſubſcribed in [z] this manner, *I Alexander Biſhop of Hierapolis Nicenæ fidei expoſitioni ſubſcripſi, have ſubſcribed to the Nicen Faith, and if you ſhall doe any thing according to the faith expounded at Nice, to that I aſſent*: in the like ſort ſubſcribed they all. To the Emperor that Conventicle thus writ [a], *we doe earneſtly deſire your pietie, that you would command, that all men ſhould ſubſcribe to the faith expounded at Nice*, and that they may teach nothing *quod ſit ab ea alienum, which is contrarie to that faith.* In another Epiſtle to the Emperour, *we came*, ſay [b] they, *to Epheſus without delay, manentes in ſola expoſitione fidei Patrum qui in Nicea convenerant, abiding in that profeſſion of faith onely, which was decreed at Nice.* In another Epiſtle having repeated the Nicen Creed, they adde [c] this,

x *Ibid.*

y *To. 3. Act. Conc. Epiſ. ca. 20.*

z *Ibid. ca. 19.*

a *Ibid. ca. 11.*

b *Append. 2. ad tom. 3. Act. Conc. Epheſ. ca. 3.*

c *To. 3. Conc. Epheſ. ca. 12.*

In

In hanc fidei expositionem nos omnes acquiescimus, wee all doe rest our selves in this declaration of faith made at Nice, we constantly perseuer in it. In their [d] Epistle to *Rufus*, we resist them, *nihil aliud spectantes, quam ut fidei Symbolum à patribus Nicenis editum, suum locum perfectè obtineat, intending or aiming at nothing else, but that the faith of the Nicene Creed, may fully and perfectly obtaine his due place and honour.* In their very Synodall sentence against *Cyrill*, and other orthodoxall Bishops, they expresse [e] this, *That they shall remaine excommunicate, untill they doe integrè suscipere, intirely embrace the Nicene faith, adding nothing unto it*; which they repeat againe in their Epistle to the Senate of *Constantinople*, saying: *If* [f] *Cyrill and the rest will repent, & forsake their hereticall doctrines, and embrace the faith of the Nicene Fathers,* they shall straight be absolved; and twentie times the like. Who reading no more but these so manie, so earnest professions of *Nestorius* and the *Nestorians*, to defend in every point the Nicene faith, without addition or alteration, would not almost sweare that these doubtlesse were the onely men that stood firme and constant for the *Nicene* Councell; and that *Cyrill* and they who tooke part with him (which was the whole Catholike Church) were the maine oppugners of that Councell, and the faith there decreed? And yet notwithstanding all these professions, these were blasphemous heretickes at that time, and most eagerly oppugned and sought to abolish that very Nicene faith, which in words they so professed and boasted of.

d *Ibid. ca. 13.*

e *Ibid. ca. 2.*

f *Ibid. ca. 6.*

9. *Vigilius* and the defenders of the *Three Chapters*, as they followed the *Nestorians* in their heresie, so did they in seeking to countenance and grace their heresie, by professing to defend the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and the faith there decreed, yea to defend it so constantly as that it might not in any part or syllable bee violated, pretending their opposites, who condemned those Chapters, to oppugne and condemne the Councell of *Chalcedon*, as the old *Nestorians* slandered *Cyrill*, and other Catholikes of those times, to condemne the Councell of *Nice*. And yet notwithstanding all these professions, *Vigilius* and his adherents were as deepe in Nestorianisme as *Nestorius* himselfe, and even while he pretends to maintaine, he doth quite overthrow the holy Councell of *Chalcedon*, and the faith therein explained.

10. But neither the old, nor later *Nestorians* are in this kind comparable to the modern *Romanists*, the last and worst sect of heretikes that ever the Church was pestered withall. Their profession is not so minute, as to boast of this or that one Councell, or of some few fathers. All Scriptures make for them, All the Fathers are theirs, All generall Councels confirme what they teach. Their bookes doe swell with this ventositie. I pray you heare the words but of one of them, but such an one, as puts downe all *Nestorians*, *Eutycheans*, *Monothelits*, and all heretickes that

that went before him; *We*, ſaith he [g], *have All authorities, Times, and places for our defence: Our enemies have none at all. Our* [h] *doctrine is taught by all godly and famous profeſſors of Divinity; All Popes, Fathers and Doctors that ever were in the Church, All Councells, particular and generall, All Vniverſities, Schooles, Colledges and places of learning, ſince the time of Chriſt to Martin Luther: It is* [i] *ratified by all authority, all Scriptures, Traditions, Prophets, Apoſtles, Evangeliſts, Sibylls, Rabbins: All holy and learned Fathers, Hiſtorians, Antiquaries, and Monuments: All Synods, Councells, Lawes, Parliaments, Canons and Decrees of Popes, of Emperours, of Kings, and Rulers: All Martyrs, Confeſſors, and holy witneſſes; by all friends and enemies, even Mahumetanes, Iewes, Pagans, Infidells; All former Heretikes, and ſchiſmatikes, by all teſtimonies that can bee deviſed, not onely in this world, but of God, of Angells and glorious ſoules, of Devills and damned ſpirits in hell.* (The fitteſt witneſſes of all.) What, any more? yes, the beſt is yet behind. *I have*, ſaith he [k], *read and ſtudied all the Scriptures, the old Teſtament in the Hebrew Text, the new in the Greeke; I have ſtudied the ancient Gloſſes and Scholies, Latine and Greeke. I have peruſed the moſt ancient Hiſtorians, Euſebius, Ruffinus, Socrates, Sozomene, Palladius*, Saint *Ierome*, Saint *Bede*, and others; *I have often with diligence conſidered the Decrees of the Popes, both of all that were before the Nicene Councell and after*, (then no doubt but he diligently conſidered of this *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution* of Pope *Vigilius*.) *I have beene an auditor both of Scholaſticall and Controverſall queſtions, where all doubts and difficulties that wit or learning can deviſe, and invent, are handled, and moſt exquiſitely debated; I have ſeene and read all the generall Councells, from the firſt at Nice, to the laſt at Trent*, (then doubt not but hee read this fift Councell:) *as alſo all approved particular and Provinciall Councells which be extant and ordinarily uſed; I have carefully read over all the workes and writings which be to be had of Dionyſius the Areopagite*, Saint *Ignatius*, Saint *Policarp*, Saint *Clement*, *Martialis*, Saint *Iuſtine*, *Origen*, Saint *Baſil*, Saint *Athanaſius*, Saint *Gregory Nazianzen*, Saint *Gregory Niſſene*, Saint *Gregory* the Great, Saint *Irene*, Saint *Cyprian*, *Fulgentius*, *Pamphilus the Martyr*, *Palladius*, *Theodoret*, *Ruffinus*, *Socrates*, *Sozomene*, *Evagrius*, *Caſſianus*, *Lactantius*, *Vincentius Lyrinenſis*; *all the workes of all theſe have I read and examined, and conferred them with* Saint *Auguſtine*, Saint *Ierome*, Saint *Ambroſe*, Saint *Leo*, *Papius*, *Theophilact*, *Tertullian*, *Euſebius*, *Prudentius*, *and others moſt excellent Divines. And I take God and the whole Court of heaven to witneſſe (before whom I muſt render an account of this proteſtation) that the ſame faith and religion which I defend, is taught and confirmed by thoſe Hebrew and Greeke Scriptures, thoſe Hiſtorians, Popes, Decrees, Scholies, and Expoſitions, Councells, Schooles and Fathers, and the profeſſion of Proteſtants condemned by the ſame.* Thus he.

g *An Apologicall Epiſtle publiſhed an.* 1601. *pa.* 118.
h *Ibid. pa.* 113.
i *Ibid. pa.* 38.
k *Ibid. pa.* 119.

11. Did ever mortall man read or heare of ſuch a braggadochio? For learning and languages *Ierome* is but a baby to him; more induſtrious and adamantine then *Origen*, then *Adamantius* himſelfe. A ſhop, a ſtorehouſe of all knowledge; his head a Library of all Fathers, Councels, Decrees, of all writings, an Heluo, nay a very hell of books, he devoures up all. *Rabſecha*, *Thraſo*, *Pyrgopolinices*, *Therapontigonus*, all ye Magnificoes & Glorioſoes, come ſit at his feet, and learne of him the

the exact forme of vaunting and reviling. What ſilly men were *Eutiches*, *Neſtorius*, and the old heretikes? they boaſted but of one or two Councells. All Councells, all Fathers, all Decrees, all bookes, writings, and records, are witneſſes of his faith. They ſayd it, he ſwears it before God and the whole Court of Heaven, that all Scriptures, Councels, Fathers, all witneſſes in heaven, earth and hell, yea the Devill and all, are his, and confirme their Romane faith, and condemne the doctrine of Proteſtants. Alas what ſhall we doe, but even hide our ſelves in caves of the earth, and clifts of the rocks, from the force and fury of this *Goliah*, who thus braves it out in the open field, as who with the onely breath of his mouth can blow away whole legions, *quaſi ventus folia, aut pannicula tectoria.*

12. But let no mans heart faint becauſe of this proud anonymall Philiſtim. Thy ſervant, O Lord, though the meaneſt in the hoſt of *Iſrael*, will fight with him; nor will I deſire any other weapons, but this one pible ſtone of the judiciall ſentence of the fift generall Councell againſt *Vigilius*. This being taken out of *Davids* bagge, that is, derived from Scriptures, conſonant to all former, and confirmed by all ſucceeding Catholike Councells and Fathers, directly and unavoydably hits him in the forehead, it gives a mortall and uncurable wound unto him, for it demonſtrates not onely the foundation of their faith to be hereticall, and for ſuch to bee condemned and accurſed by the judgement of the whole Catholike Church, but all their doctrines, whatſoever they teach, becauſe they all relye on this foundation of the Popes *infallibility*, are not onely unſound, and in the root hereticall, but even Antichriſtian alſo, ſuch as utterly overthrow the whole Catholike faith. This, being one part of the Philiſtimes weapons, wherein he truſted and vanted, with his owne ſword is his head, (the head and foundation of all their faith) cut off, ſo that of him and the whole body of their Church it may be truly ſaid, *Iacet ingens littore truncus, Avulſumq; humeris caput, & ſine nomine corpus.*

13. You ſee now how both ancient and moderne heretikes boaſt of Councells, and therefore, that the reaſon of *Baronius* is moſt inconſequent, that *Vigilius* was no heretike becauſe hee profeſſeth to hold the Councell of *Chalcedon*. Nay I ſay more, though one profeſſe to hold the whole Scripture, yet if with pertinacy hee hold any one doctrine repugnant thereunto, the profeſſion of the Scriptures themſelves cannot excuſe ſuch a man from being an heretike; If it could, then not any of the old heretikes would want this pretence: or, to omit them, ſeeing both Proteſtants and Papiſts make profeſſion to beleeve the Scriptures, and whatſoever is taught therein; would this profeſſion exempt one from hereſie, neither they, nor wee, ſhould be, or be called heretikes. But ſeeing in truth they are, and wee in their Antichriſtian language are called heretikes, as *Cyrill*, and the orthodoxall beleevers in his time, were by the Neſtorians, it is without queſtion that this profeſſion to hold the whole Scriptures, much leſſe to hold one or two Councells (as *Vigilius* did) cannot free one from being an heretike.

14. You will perhaps ſay, can one then beleeve the whole Scripture,

ture, and be an heretike, or beleeve the faith decreed at *Nice*, *Epheſus*, or *Chalcedon*; and be an *Arian*, *Eutychean* or *Neſtorian* heretike? No verily, for as the Scripture containeth a contradiction to every hereſie, ſeeing as Saint *Auſten* truly ſaith[1], *all doctrines concerning faith, are ſet downe, and that alſo perſpicuouſly therein*: ſo doe every one of thoſe three Councels containe a contradiction to every one of thoſe three hereſies, and to all other which concerne the divinity or humanity of Chriſt. But it is one thing to profeſſe the ſcriptures, or thoſe three Councells, and ſay that he beleeves them, which many heretikes may doe; and another thing to beleeve them indeed, which none can doe and be an heretike, for whoſoever truly beleeveth the ſcriptures, cannot poſſibly with pertinacy hold any doctrine repugnant to ſcriptures; but ſuch a man upon evident declaration that this is taught in them (though before he held the contrary) preſently ſubmits his wit and will to the truth which out of them is manifeſted unto him. If this he do not, he manifeſtly declareth, that he holds his error with pertinacy, and with an obſtinate reſolution not to yeeld to the truth of the ſcriptures, and ſo hee is certainly an heretike, notwithſtanding his profeſſion of the ſcriptures, which he falſly ſaid he beleeved, and held, when in very truth he held, and that pertinaciouſly the quite contrary unto them. The very like muſt be ſaid of thoſe three Councells, and them who either truly beleeve, or falſly ſay, that they beleeve the faith explained in them, or any one of them.

[1] Lib. 2. de doct. Chriſt. ca. 9.

15. Whence two things are evidently conſequent, the former, that all heretikes are lyars in their profeſſion: not onely becauſe they profeſſe that doctrine which is untrue, and hereticall, but becauſe in words they profeſſe to beleeve and hold that doctrine which they doe not, but hold, and that for a point of their faith, the quite contrary: All of them will and doe profeſſe that they beleeve the ſcriptures, and the doctrines therein contained: and yet every one of them lye herein, for they beleeve one, if not moe doctrines contrary to the ſcriptures. The *Neſtorians* profeſſed to hold the *Nicene* faith, and ſo they profeſſed two natures and but one perſon to bee in Chriſt, for that in the *Nicene* faith is certainly decreed: but they lyed in making this profeſſion, for they beleeved not one perſon, but pertinaciouſly held two perſons to be in Chriſt. The *Eutycheans* in profeſſing the *Epheſine* Councell, profeſſed in effect two natures to abide in Chriſt after the union, for this was certainly the faith of that holy Councell, but they lyed in this profeſſion, for they held that after the union two natures did not abide in Chriſt, but one onely. The Church of *Rome* and members thereof profeſſe to hold the faith of the fift generall Councell, and ſo profeſſe *implicitè* the Popes *Cathedrall* ſentence in a cauſe of faith to be *fallible* and hereticall: but they lye in making this profeſſion, for they beleeve not the Popes ſentence in ſuch cauſes to be fallible, but with the *Laterane* and *Trent* Councels, they hold it to be *infallible*. It is the practice of all heretikes to make ſuch faire, though lying profeſſions. For ſhould they ſay in plaine termes, (that which is truth indeed) wee beleeve not the ſcriptures, nor the Councells of *Nice*, *Epheſus*, or *Chalcedon*; every man would ſpit at them, and

deteſt them, *cane pejus & angue*, nor could they ever deceive any, or gaine one proſelyte. But when they commend their faith (that is, their hereſie) to be the ſame doctrine with the ſcriptures, which the Councells of *Nice*, *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon* taught, by theſe faire pretences, and this lying profeſſion, they inſinuate themſelves into the hearts of the ſimple, deceiving hereby both themſelves and others.

16. The other conſequent is this, That the profeſſion of all heretikes is contradictory to it ſelfe. For they profeſſe to hold the ſcriptures, and ſo to condemne every hereſie, and yet withal they profeſſe one private doctrine repugnant to ſcripture, and which is an hereſie. The like may be ſaid of the Councells. The *Neſtorians* by profeſsing to hold the faith decreed at *Nice*, profeſſe Chriſt to bee but one perſon, and yet withall by holding *Neſtorianiſme*, they profeſſe Chriſt to be two perſons. The *Eutycheans* by profeſsing to hold the Councell of *Epheſus*, profeſſe two natures to remaine in Chriſt after the union; which in that Councell is certainly decreed, and yet by profeſsing the hereſie of *Eutyches*, they profeſſe the quite contradictory, that one nature onely remaines after the union. The Church of *Rome* and members thereof, by profeſſing the faith of the fift Councell, profeſſe the Popes *Cathedrall* ſentence in a cauſe of faith to be *fallible*, and *de facto* to have beene *hereticall*; and yet they profeſſe the direct contradictory, as the Councell of *Laterane* hath defined, that the Popes ſentence in ſuch cauſes is *infallible*, and neither hath beene nor can be *hereticall*. So repugnant to it ſelfe, and incoherent is the profeſſion of all heretikes, that it fighteth both with the truth, and with it owne ſelfe alſo. The very ſame is to be ſeene in *Vigilius* and his *Conſtitution*. For in profeſſing to defend the *three Chapters*, and in decreeing that all ſhall defend them, he profeſſeth all the blaſphemies of *Neſtorius*, and decreeth that all ſhall maintaine them, and profeſſing to hold the faith decreed at *Chalcedon*, and decreeing that all ſhall hold it, hee profeſſeth that *Neſtorianiſme* is hereſie, and decreeth that all ſhall condemne it for hereſie: and ſo decreeing both theſe, he decreeth that all men in the world ſhall beleeve two contradictories, and beleeve them as Catholike Truths. Such a worthy *Apoſtolicall* decree is this of *Vigilius*, for defending whereof *Baronius* doth more then toyle himſelfe.

17. You will againe demand: Seeing *Vigilius* doth ſo earneſtly and plainely profeſſe both theſe, why ſhall not his expreſſe profeſſion to hold the Councell of *Chalcedon*, make him or ſhew him to bee a Catholike, rather then his other expreſſe profeſſion, to defend the *Three Chapters*, make or ſhew him to bee an hereticke? Why rather ſhall his *hereticall*, then his *orthodoxall* profeſſion give denomination unto him? I alſo demand of you, Seeing every hereticke in expreſſe words profeſſeth to beleeve the whole Scripture, which is in effect a condemning of every hereſie, why ſhall not this *orthodoxall* profeſſion make or ſhew him to be a Catholike, rather then his expreſſe profeſſion of ſome one doctrine contrarie to Scripture (ſay for example ſake, of *Arianiſme*) make or ſhew him to bee an *Arian* hereticke? The reaſon

reason of both is one and the same. Did an *Arian* so professe to hold the Scriptures, that hee were resolved to forsake his *Arianisme*, and confesse Christ to bee ὁμοούσιον upon manifestation that the Scriptures taught this, certainely his professiō of *Arianisme*, with such a professiō to hold the Scriptures, could not make him an hereticke, no more then *Cyprians* profession of Rebaptization, or *Irenees* of the millenarie heresie, did make them heretikes: Erre hee should, as they did, but being not pertinacious in error, hereticke hee could not be, as they were not. But it falls out otherwise with all heretickes. They professe to hold the Scripture, yet so that they resolve not to forsake that private doctrine which they have chosen to maintaine: That they will hold, and they will have that to be the doctrine of the Scripture, notwithstanding all manifestation to the contrarie, even of the Scriptures themselves. They resolve of this, that whosoever, Bishops, Councells, or Church, teach the contrarie to that, or say & judge that the Scripture so teacheth, they all erre or mistake the meaning of the Scriptures. Thus did not *Cyprian*, nor *Irenee*. And this wilfull and pertinacious resolution it is, which evidently sheweth that in truth they beleeve not the Scriptures, but beleeve their own fancies, though they say a thousand times, that they beleeve and embrace whatsoever the Scriptures teach, for did they beleeve any doctrine, say *Arianisme*, *eo nomine*, because the Scripture teacheth it, they would presently beleeve the contrarie thereunto, when it were manifested unto them (as is was to the *Arians*, by the *Nicen* Coūcell) that the Scripture taught the contrarie to their error. Seeing this they will not doe, It is certaine that they hold their private opiniō, *eo nomine* because they will hold it; and they hold it to bee the doctrine of scripture, not because it is so, but because they will have it to bee so, say what any will or can to the contrarie. So their owne will, and not Scripture, is the reason why they beleeve it, nay why they hold it with such a stiffe opinion, for beleife it is not, it cannot be. This pertinacie to have beene in the *Nestorians*, *Eutycheans* and the rest, is evident. Had they beleeved, as they professed, the faith decreed at *Nice* and *Ephesus*, then upon manifestation of their errors out of those Councels, they would have renounced their heresies: but seeing the *Nestorians* persisted to hold two persons in Christ, notwithstanding, that the whole Councell of *Ephesus* manifested unto them that the *Nicene* Councel held but one person, and seeing the *Eutycheans* persisted to hold but one nature after the union, notwithstanding that the whole Councell at *Chalcedon* manifested unto them, that the holy *Ephesine* Synod held two natures to abide in him after the union, they did hereby make it evident unto all, that they so professed to hold those Councels, as that they resolved not to forsake their *Nestorian* and *Eutichean* heresies for any manifestation of the truth, or conviction of their error out of those Councels, and their profession of them was in effect as if they had said, we hold those Councels, and will have them to teach what wee affirme, whatsoever any man or Councell saith, or can say to the contrarie. The like must be said of Pope *Vigilius* in this cause: Had he so professed to hold the Councell of *Chalcedon*, as that upon manifestion

that the *Three Chapters* were condemned by it, he would have forſaken the defence of them, then certainely his defending of theſe 3. *Chapters* had not bin pertinacious, nor ſhould have made him an hereticke, but his profeſſion to hold the faith decreed at *Chalcedon*, notwithſtanding his error about the 3. *Chapters*, ſhould have made him a catholike. But ſeeing *Vig.* perſiſted to defend the 3. *Chapt.* though it was made evidēt unto him by the Synodall judgement of the fift Councell, that the definition of faith decreed at *Chalcedon* condemned them all, he by this perſiſting in hereſie did demonſtrate to all, that he profeſſed to hold the Councell at *Chalcedon*, no otherwiſe then with a pertinacious reſolution not to forſake the defence of thoſe *Three hereticall Chapters*, although the whole Church of God ſhould manifeſt unto him, that the Councell of *Chalcedon* condemned the ſame: and for this cauſe his defending of thoſe *three Chapters*, with this pertinacie and wilfull reſolution declareth him to bee indeed an hereticke, notwithſtanding his profeſſion to hold the Councell of *Chalcedon* and faith thereof, whereby all thoſe Chapters are condemned, which profeſſion being joyned with the former pertinacie, could not now either make or declare him to be a Catholike.

18. The very ſame muſt bee ſaid of the preſent *Romane* Church and members thereof. Did they in ſuch ſort profeſſe to hold the fift Councel, and faith thereof, as that upon manifeſtation that this Councell beleeved, taught and decreed that the Popes *Cathedrall* ſentence in a cauſe of faith is *fallible*, and *de facto* hath beene hereticall, they would condemne that their *fundamentall* hereſie of the Popes *Cathedrall infallibilitie* decreed in their *Laterane* and *Trent* aſſemblies, then ſhould they much rather, for their profeſſion of the fift Councell and faith thereof, bee *orthodoxall*, then for profeſſing (together with this) the Popes *Cathedrall infallibilitie*, bee hereticall. But ſeeing they know by the very Acts and judiciall ſentence of that fift Councell, by which the *Cathedrall Conſtitution* of *Vigilius* is condemned and accurſed for hereticall in this cauſe of faith, touching the *Three Chapters*, that the fift Councell beleeved this, and decreed, under the cenſure of an *Anathema*, that all others ſhould beleeve it, and that all who beleeve the contrary, are heretikes: ſeeing, I ſay, notwithſtanding this manifeſtation of the faith of that Councell, they perſiſt to defend the Popes *Cathedrall infallibility* in thoſe cauſes, yea, defend it as the very foundation of their faith; this makes it evident to all, that they do no otherwiſe profeſſe to hold this fift Councell, or the other, whether precedent, or following, (for they all are conſonant to this) but with this pertinacious reſolution, not to forſake that their *fundamentall* hereſie; and therefore their expreſſe profeſſion of this fift, and other generall Councels, yea, of the Scriptures themſelves, cannot be ſo effectuall to make them Catholikes, as the profeſſion of the Popes *infallibility*, which is joyned with this pertinacy, is to make and demonſtrate them to be heretikes.

19. There is yet a further point to be obſerved touching the pertinacy of *Vigilius*: For one may be, and often is pertinacious in his errour, not onely after, but even before conviction, or manifeſtation of the

the truth made unto him; and this happeneth whensoever hee is not *paratus corrigi, prepared, or ready to be informed of the truth*, and corrected thereby, or when he doth not, or will not, *tanta solicitudine quærere veritatem, with care and diligence seeke to know the truth*, as after S. *Austen* [m], and out of him *Occham* [n], *Gerson* [o], *Navar* [p], *Alphonsus à Castro* [q], and many others doe truly teach. See now, I pray you, how farre *Vigilius* was from this care of seeking, and preparation to embrace the truth. He by his *Apostolicall* authoritie decreed [r], that none should either write, or speake, or teach ought contrary to his *Constitution*; or if they did, that his decree should stand for a condemnation and refutation of whatsoever they should either write or speake. Here was a tricke of *Papall*, that is, of the most supreme pertinacy that can bee devised: He takes order before hand, that none shall ever, I say, not convict him, but, so much as manifest the truth unto him, or open his mouth, or write a syllable for the manifestation thereof: and so, being not prepared to bee corrected, no nor informed neither, hee was pertinacious, and is justly to bee so accounted before ever either Bishop, or Councell manifested the truth unto him. Even as he is farre more wilfully and obstinately delighted in darknesse, who dammes up all the windowes, chinkes, and passages, whereby any light might enter into the house, wherein hee is, than hee, who lyeth asleepe, and is willing to be awaked, when the light shineth about him: So was it with Pope *Vigilius* at this time; his tying of al mens tongues, and hands, that they should not manifest by word, or writing, the truth unto him; his damming up of the light, that never any glimpse of the truth might shine unto him, argues a mind most damnably pertinacious in errour, and so far from being prepared and ready to embrace the truth, that it is obdurate against the same, and will not permit it so much as to come neere unto him.

m Epist. 162.
n Lib. 4. part. 1. ca. 2.
o Cons. 12. de pertinacia. part. 1. pa. 430.
p Ench. ca. 11. nu. 22.
q Lib. 1. de justa punit. heret. ca. 7
r Const. Vigil. apud Bar. an. 553. nu. 208.

20. The very like pertinacy is at this day in the *Romane* Church, and all the members thereof: for having once set downe this transcendent principle, the *foundation* of all which they beleeve; that the Popes judgement, in causes of faith, is *infallible*, they doe by this exclude and utterly shut out all manifestation of the truth, that can possibly bee made unto them: Oppose whatsoever you will against their errour, Scriptures, Fathers, Councels, reason and sense it selfe, it is all refuted before it be proposed; seeing the Pope, who is *infallible*, saith the contrary to that which you would prove, you, in disputing from those places, doe either mis-cite them, or mis-interpret the Scriptures, Fathers, and Councels, or your reason from them is sophisticall, and your sense of sight, of touching, of tasting, is deceived, some one defect or other there is in your opposition; but an errour in that which they hold, there is, nay, there can be none, because the Pope teacheth that, and the Pope, in his teaching is *infallible*. Here is a charme, which causeth one to heare with a deafe eare, whatsoever is opposed: the very head of *Medusa*, if you come against it, it stunnes you at the first, and turnes both your reason, your sense, and your selfe also, into a very stone. By holding this one *fundamentall* position, they are pertinacibus in all their errours, and that in the highest degree of pertinacy, which

which the wit of man can deviſe; yea, and pertinacious before all conviction, and that alſo though the truth ſhould never by any meanes be manifeſted unto them: For by ſetting this downe, they are ſo far from being prepared to embrace the truth, though it ſhould be manifeſted unto them, that hereby they have made a *fundamentall* law for themſelves, that they never will be convicted, nor ever have the truth manifeſted unto them. The onely meanes in likelihood to perſwade them, that the doctrines which they maintaine, are hereſies, were firſt to perſwade the Pope, who hath decreed them to bee *orthodoxall*, to make a contrary decree, that they are *hereticall*. Now although this may be morally judged, to be a matter of impoſſibilitie; yet, if his Holineſſe could be induced hereunto, and would ſo farre ſtoope to Gods truth, as to make ſuch a decree; even this alſo could not perſwade them, ſo long as they hold that *foundation*. They would ſay, either the Pope were not the true Pope, or that he defined it not as Pope, and *ex Cathedra*; or that, by conſenting to ſuch an hereticall decree, hee ceaſed *ipſo facto* to be Pope, or the like; ſome one or other evaſion they would have ſtill: but, grant the Popes ſentence to be *fallible*, or hereticall, whoſe *infallibility* they hold as a doctrine of faith, yea, as the *foundation* of their faith, they would not. Such, and ſo unconquerable pertinacy is annexed, and that eſſentially, to that one *Poſition*, that ſo long as one holds it, (and whenſoever he ceaſeth to hold it, hee ceaſeth to be a member of their Church,) there is no poſſible meanes in the world to convict him, or convert him to the truth.

21. You doe now clearely ſee, how feeble, and inconſequent that Collection is, which *Baronius* here uſeth in excuſe of Pope *Vigilius*, for that he often profeſſeth to defend the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and the faith therein explaned: Hee did but herein that which is the uſuall cuſtome of all other heretikes, both ancient and moderne: Quit him for this cauſe, and quit them all; condemne them, and then, this pretẽce can no way excuſe *Vigilius* frõ hereſie. They all with him profeſſe, with great oſtentation to hold the doctrines of the Scriptures, of Fathers, of generall Councels, but becauſe their profeſſion is not onely lying, and contradictorie to it ſelfe, but alwayes ſuch, as that they retaine a wilfull and pertinacious reſolution, not to forſake that hereſie which themſelves embrace, as *Vigilius* had, not to forſake his defence of the *Three Chapters*: Hence it is that their verbal profeſſion of Scriptures, Fathers, and Councels, cannot make any of them, nor *Vigilius* among them, to be eſteemed *orthodoxall*, or Catholike: but the reall and cordiall profeſſion of any one doctrine, which they, with ſuch pertinacy hold againſt the Scriptures, or holy generall Councels, as *Vigilius* did this of the *Three Chapters*, doth truly demonſtrate them all, and *Vigilius* among them, to be heretikes. And this may ſuffice for anſwer to the ſecond exception, or evaſion of *Baronius*.

Cap. 15.

The third exception of Baronius *in excuſe of* Vigilius, *taken from his confirming of the fift Councell, anſwered; and how Pope* Vigilius, three or foure times changed his judgement in this cauſe of faith.

1. IN the third place *Baronius* comes to excuſe *Vigilius*, by his act of confirming and approving the fift Councell, and the decree thereof for condemning the *Three Chapters*, *It appeareth*, ſaith hee [a], *that Vigilius, to the end he might take away the ſchiſme, and unite the Eaſterne Churches to the Catholike communion, quintam Synodum authoritate Apoſtolica comprobavit, did approve the fift Synod by his Apoſtolicall authoritie.* Againe [b], *when Vigilius ſaw, that the Eaſterne Church would bee rent from the Weſt, unleſſe he conſented to the fift Synod, eam probavit, he approved it:* Again [c], *Pelagius thought it fit, as Vigilius had thought before, that the fift Synod, wherein the three Chapters were condemned, ſhould bee approved:* and again [d], *Cognitum fuit, it was publikely known*, that *Vigilius* had approved the fift Synod, and condemned the *three Chapters*. The like is affirmed by *Bellarmine* [e], *Vigilius confirmed the fift Synod, per libellum, by a booke, or writing. Binius* is ſo reſolute herein, that hee ſaith [f], *A Vigilio (quintam) Synodum confirmatam et approbatam eſſe nemo dubitat; none doubteth but that Vigilius confirmed and approved the fift Councell.* Now if *Vigilius* approved the fift Councell, and condemned the *Three Chapters*, it ſeemes that all which wee have ſaid of his contradicting the fift Synod, and of his defending thoſe *Three Chapters*, is of no force, and that by his aſſent to the Synod he is a good Catholike. This is the Exception, the validity whereof we are now to examine.

a *An.* 554. *nu.* 7.

b *An.* 553. *nu.* 235.

c *Ibid. nu.* 236.

d *An.* 556. *nu.* 1.

e *Lib.* 1. *de Conc. ca.* 5. § *Conſta.*

f *Not. in Conc.* 5. § *Præſitit.*

2. For the clearing of which whole matter, it muſt bee remembred, that all, which hitherto wee have ſpoken of *Vigilius*, hath reference to his *Apoſtolicall decree*, publiſhed in defence of thoſe *Three Chapters*, that is, to *Vigilius*, being ſuch as that decree doth ſhew, and demonſtrate him to have beene, even a pertinacious oppugner of the faith, and a condemned heretike by the judiciall ſentence of the fift Councell: but now *Baronius* drawes us to a further examination of the cariage of *Vigilius* in this whole buſineſſe, and how hee behaved himſelfe from the firſt publiſhing of the Emperours Edict, which was in the twentieth [g] yeare of *Iuſtinian*, unto the death of *Vigilius*, which was, as *Baronius* accounteth [h], in the 29 of *Iuſtinian*, and ſecond yeare after the fift Councell was ended; but, as *Victor*, (who then lived) accounteth [i], in the 31 of *Iuſtinian*, and fourth yeare after the Synod: And, for the more cleare view of his cariage, wee muſt obſerve foure ſeverall periods of time, wherein *Vigilius*, during thoſe nine or tenne yeares, gave divers ſeverall judgements, and made three or foure eminent changes in this cauſe of faith. The firſt, from the promulgation of the Emperours Edict, while he remained at *Rome*, and was abſent from the Emperor. The ſecond, after he came to *Conſtantinople*, and to the

g *Bar. an.* 546. *nu.* 8.

h *An.* 555. *nu.* 1.

i *In Chron. an.* 17. *poſt Coſſ. Baſil.*

the Emperours preſence, but before the fift Synod was begun. The third, in the time of the fift Synod, and about a yeare after the end and diſſolution thereof. The fourth, from thence, that is, from the yeare after the Synod, unto his death.

k *Ipſo exordio aſſertæ ab Imperatore ſententiæ. Bar. an. 546 nu. 38. et 39.*

3. At the firſt [k] publiſhing of the Edict, many of the Weſterne Churches, *impugnabant Edictum*, did oppoſe themſelves to it, and, as *Baronius* ſaith, *inſurrexere*, made an inſurrection againſt it, and the Emperour: Pope *Vigilius*, as in place and dignity hee was more eminent, ſo in this Inſurrection he was more forward, and a ring-leader unto them all: And becauſe the conflict was likely to bee troubleſome, *Vigilius* uſed all his authority and art in managing of this cauſe. Firſt, he proclameth the Edict, and condemning of the *Three Chapters* to bee a prophane [l] novelty, judging [m] it to bee contrary to the holy faith, and Councell at *Chalcedon*: To this he addes writings, threats, and puniſhments: *Literas ſcripſit adverſus eos*, ſaith *Baronius* [n], *Vigilius writ letters againſt all that held with the Emperor, and his Edict*: in thoſe letters, *comminatus* [o] *eſt eis qui conſenſerunt; he threatned thoſe that conſented to the Emperor; edixit* [p] *& indixit correctionem; he decreed puniſhment unto them, and forewarned them thereof*; telling them, that unleſſe they did amend their fault, hee would draw out his *Apoſtolike* blade againſt them, proteſting with the Apoſtle [q], *I feare when I come, I ſhall not finde you ſuch as I would, and that I ſhall be found of you ſuch as yee would not*. Nor were his threats in vaine, as it ſeemeth, ſeeing *Baronius* [r] tells us, that for this very cauſe, either he or *Stephanus* his Legate, in his name did excommunicate, beſides others, two Patriarkes, *Mennas* of *Conſtantinople*, and *Zoilus* of *Alexandria*, and with them *Theodorus* Biſhop of *Ceſarea*.

l *Ille (Vigilius) prophanas vetum novitates ſibi vendicavit arguendas. Ait Facund. apud Bar. an. 546. nu. 57.*

m *Niſi contrarium Synodo Chalcedonenſi judicaret. Ibid. nu. 58.*

n *An. 547. nu. 44. et 32.*

o *Ibid.*

p *Facund. loco cit. nu. 56.*

q *2 Cor. 12. v. 22.*

r *An. 546. nu. 47. et 547. nu. 45.*

4. Thus he dealt with inferiour perſons, but for the Emperour he took another courſe with him: He ſaw what danger it was to write againſt Emperors, that he would not do himſelf: But whē, like *Pirrhus*, *ipſe ſibi cavit loco, he had provided for his owne ſafety*; then he thruſts forward *Facundus* Biſhop of *Hermian* into that buſines. *Facundus* an eloquent mā indeed, as his name alſo imports, but a moſt obſtinate heretike & Schiſmatike, ſeeing he perſiſted in defēce of the *three Chapters*, not only before, but after the judicial ſentēce of the generall Councel; & yet is he cōmended by *Baronius* [s] to be *prudentiſſimus agoniſtes, a moſt wiſe champion for the Church*: but the more hereticall hee is, the more like, and better liked is hee to *Baronius*. Him doth *Vigilius* [t] egge, and even command to write againſt the Emperour; yea, *ſugillare*, (it is the Cardinals word) *to taunt and flout him*, for his Edict; nor him onely, but in him to reprove, *omnes ſimul Principes*, all Princes whoſoever doe preſume to meddle with a cauſe of faith, or make lawes therein, as *Iuſtinian* had done. *Facundus* being thus directed, incouraged, and warranted by Pope *Vigilius*, and being but his inſtrument in this matter, writes [u] a large volume containing twelve bookes, againſt the Emperor, in defence of the *three Chapters*. A worke ſtuffed with hereſie, yet highly commended by *Poſſevine* [x] the Ieſuite, as being a brave booke ſtrengthned with the authorities of the Fathers. There he takes upon him to revile the Emperor in moſt uncivill and undu-

s *An. 546. nu. 44*

t *Hæc Facundus jubente Vigilio. Bar. ibid.*

u *Scriptum adverſus Imperatorem edidit. An. eod. nu. 39.*

x *Opus grande & elegans, et patrum authoritatibus munitum. Poſſ. Bibl. in Facund.*

iſull

tifull manner, as if, forsooth, *fides* [y] *omnium ex ejus volumine penderet; the faith of all Churches did hang on the Emperours sleeve*; and as if none might beleeve otherwise, *quam præciperet imperator, then the Emperour commanded*; telling him, that it were more meet for him, *se intra limitem suum continere, to keepe himselfe within his owne bounds*, as other Artificers kept their own shops; the Weaver not medling with the Forge and Anvill, nor the Cobler with a Carpenters office. Such rude, homely, and undutifull comparisons doth the Popes Oratour use in this cause: And, as if *Facundus* had not paid the Emperour halfe enough, *Baronius* helpes him with a whole Cart-load of such Romish eloquence; calling the Emperour, utterly [a] unlearned, *qui* [b] *nec Alphabetum aliquando didicisse; who never had learned so much as his A, B, C, nor could* [c] *ever read the Title of the Bible: a Pamie* [d], *a pallated Theologue, a sacrilegious* [e] *person, a witlesse* [f], *furious, and frantike fellow, possessed with an evill spirit, and driven by the Devill himselfe*: Such an one to [g] presume against all right, to make lawes concerning matters of faith, concerning Priests, and the punishments of them? adding [h], that the whole Catholike faith would be in jeopardie, *si qui ejusmodi esset; if such as Iustinian should makes lawes of faith*; yea, such lawes, *quas* [i] *delasé conscripsissent hæretici, as heretikes had craftily penned*; telling [k] him, (as *Facundus* had before) that it were more fit for him to looke to the government of the Empire; and upbraiding him with that proverbiall admonition, *Ne ultra Crepidam*, S^r Cobler go not beyond your Last & Latchet. This scurrility doth the Cardinall use against the most religious and prudent Emperour, and his holy and orthodoxall Edict; and hee saith, that he was [l] willing to adde these, *ad roborandam Facundi sententiam, to fortifie the sentence of Facundus*, whereby he, with *Vigilius*, did defend the *Three Chapters*.

y *Facund. lib. 12 ejus verba citantur à Bar. an. 546. nu. 42.*

a *An. 546. nu. 41*
b *An. 528. nu. 2. ut qui nec prima elementa calleret ut legere posset. An. 446. nu. 43.*
c *An. 551. nu. 4*
d *Repente ex pauper palliatus Theologus. An. 551. nu. 43.*
e *An. 552. nu. 8.*
f *The fierce peruicious, ignorant, almost mad, furious, and malignant spirit, agitated & actuated. An. 551. nu. 2.*
g *Prater fas, & fasque præsumens. An. 528. nu. 2.*
h *An. 546. nu. 43.*
i *Ibid. nu. 41.*
k *An. 550. nu. 14.*
l *Hæc addidisse voluimus. An. 546. nu. 43.*

5. Were one disposed to make sport with the Cardinall, himselfe here offereth a large field, wherein one may exspaciate, and seeing he useth not others as Kings, hee might expect, *lege talionis*, not to bee used himselfe as a Cardinall: But because wee shall in another place more fitly convince the Cardinall, both for his reviling the Emperor, and raling at his Edict, as penned by heretikes, for this time I will but by the way observe two or three points touching this passage. The first, that *Facundus* by defending the *Three Chapters*, and *Baronius* by fortifying his defence, doe unavoydably pull upon themselves the just censure of *Anathema*, denounced by the holy Councell against the defenders of those Chapters, and those who are abetters of them: So, the more *Baronius* doth labour to fortifie the sentence of *Facundus*, the more he entangles himselfe in that curse of the generall Councel. The second, that both *Facundus* & *Baronius* do quite mistake the matter, in carping at the Emperour, as if by his Edict, or in condemning those *Three Chapters*, he had taught or published some new doctrine of faith, he did not: He taught and commanded all others to embrace that true, ancient, and Apostolicall faith, which was decreed and explained at *Chalcedon*, as both the whole fift Councell witnesseth, which sheweth, that all those Chapters were *impiè*, but yet truly, and indeed condemned in the definition of faith made at *Chalcedon*;

cedon; and Pope *Gregorie* alſo teſtifieth the ſame, ſaying of this fift Councell, that it was *in omnibus ſequax, in every point a follower of the Councell at Chalcedon.* This the religious Emperour wiſely diſcerning, did by his imperiall edict, and authoritie (as *Conſtantine*, and *Theodoſius* had done before him) ratifie that old and Catholike faith, which the *Neſtorians* by defending thoſe Chapters craftily undermined at that time. The third & ſpeciall point which I obſerve, is that which *Baronius* noteth, as the cauſe why Pope *Vigil.* was ſo eager againſt the Emperor and his edict. And what thinke you was it? Forſooth becauſe, *Iuſtinian primus* [m] *legem ſancivit, was the firſt who made a law*, and publiſhed a Decree for condemning of thoſe *three Chapters*. Had the Pope firſt done this, and *Iuſtinian* ſeconded his holineſſe therein, hee had beene another *Conſtantine*, a ſecond *Theodoſius*, the deareſt child of the Church. But for Princes to preſume to teach the Pope, or make any lawes concerning the faith, before they conſult with the Romane *Apollo*, or make him acquainted therewith, thats [n] *piaculum*, a capitall, an irremiſſible ſinne, the Pope may not endure it. So then, is was neither zeale, not pietie, nor love to the truth, but meere ſtomacke and pride in *Vigilius* to oppoſe himſelfe to the Emperours edict, and make an inſurrection againſt him. A ſory reaſon God wot for any wiſe man in the world, much more for the Pope, to contradict the truth and oppugne the Catholike faith. Now if *Iuſtinian* for doing this which was an act of prudence and pietie, tending wholy to the good and peace of the Church, if hee could not eſcape ſo undutifull uſage at the Pope, & his orators in thoſe better times, religious Kings may not thinke it ſtrange, to finde the like or far worſe entertainment at the Popes of theſe dayes and their inſtruments, men ſo exact and eloquent in reviling, that in all ſuch baſe and uncivill uſage they goe as farre beyond *Facundus*, *Tertullus*, and them of former ages, as droſſe or the moſt abject mettle is inferiour to refined gold. This is the firſt Period, and firſt judgement of *Vigilius* touching this cauſe of the *three Chapters*: in defence of which, and oppugning of the Emperours edict, hee continued more then a yeare after the publiſhing of the Edict, even all that time while hee remained at *Rome*, and was abſent from the Emperour.

m *An.* 553. *nu.* 337.

n *Vel ſi reſtum fuiſſet, reſte non fieret, quia nulli Regum hinc aliquid agere, ſed ſolis eſt ſacerdotibus datum. Facund. & Bar. an.* 547. *nu.* 35. *Imperator. eſt fidem coram ſacerdotibus profiteri, non eandem præſcribere ſacerdotibus Bar. ibid.*

6. As ſoone almoſt as *Vigilius* was come to *Conſtantinople*, and had ſaluted the Emperor, and conferred with them who ſtood for the Edict, he was quite another man, he changed *cum cælo animum, the aire of the Emperors Court altered the Popes judgement*, and this was about a yeare after [o] the publiſhing of the Edict: Now that all things might be done with more ſolemnitie and adviſe, there was a Synod [p] held ſhortly after his comming, at *Conſtantinople*, wherein *Vigilius* with thirty Biſhops condemned the *Three Chapters*, and conſented to the Emperors Edict. This *Facundus* expreſly witneſſeth, ſaying [q], *How ſhall not this bee a prejudice to the cauſe, if it bee demonſtrated that Pope* Vigilius *with thirty Biſhops or therabouts, have condemned the Epiſtle (of Ibas) approved by the Councell of Chalcedon, and anathematized that Biſhop (Theodorus of Mopſveſtia) with his doctrines, the praiſes whereof are ſet downe in that Councell?* Thus *Facundus*. Beſides all this, *Vigilius* was

o *Edictũ editũ fuit anno.* 546. *Bar. eo anno nu.* 8. *Conſtantinopolin ingreſſus eſt an.* 547. *prope diẽ Natalis Domini. Bar. an.* 550. *nu.* 26.

p *Bar. an. eod. nu.* 31. 32.

q *Ibid. nu.* 37.

now

now ſo forward in this cauſe, that as before he had written bookes againſt the Edict, in defence of the *three Chapters*; and excommunicated thoſe who condemned thoſe Chapters; ſo now on the Emperors ſide, he writ bookes, and gave judgement, for the condemning of thoſe Chapters, and excommunicated ſome, by name, *Ruſticus* and *Sebaſtianus*, two Romane Deacons, becauſe they would not condemne them. *None can deny* ſaith *Baronius* [d], *that* Vigilius *writ a booke againſt the three chapters, and ſent it unto Mennas Biſhop of Conſtantinople.* Again, there [e] is certaine proofe, *lata ab eo ſententia, of the ſentence (of excommunication) pronounced by* Vigilius, *againſt Ruſticus, Sebaſtianus, and other defenders of thoſe chapters*: and this is ſo cleare, *ut nulla dubitatio eſſe poſſit, that there can be no doubt at all, but that* Vigilius *approved by a Conſtitution the Emperors ſentence, and condemned the three Chapters.* So *Baronius*. The Epiſtles of *Vigilius* doe teſtifie the ſame. In that [f] to *Ruſticus* and *Sebaſtianus* he very often makes mention, *Iudicati noſtri, Conſtituti noſtri, of our judgement, of our conſtitution* againſt the *three chapters*, concerning which he addeth [g], that it was ratified by his *Apoſtolicall* authority, ſaying, that no man may doe, *contra conſtitutum noſtrum quod ex beati Petri authoritate proferimus, againſt this our Conſtitution which we ſet forth by the authority of Saint Peter.* The like hee teſtifieth, in his Epiſtle [h] to *Valentinianus*, *We believe* ſaith he, *that thoſe things may ſuffice the children of the Church, which we writ to Mennas, concerning the blaſphemies of Theodorus of Mopſveſtia and his perſon, concerning the Epiſtle of Ibas, and the writings of Theodoret againſt the right faith.* Thus *Vigilius* conſenting now with the Emperor, defending his Imperiall Edict, and condemning the *three Chapters*; in all which, his profeſſion was Catholike and orthodoxall.

d *An.* 547. *nu.* 40.
e *Ibid.*
f *Extat in Coll.* 7. *Conc.* 5. *pa.* 578.
g *Ibid. pa.* 580.
h *Ibid.*

7. When *Vigilius* was thus turned an Imperialiſt, and in regard of his outward profeſſion declared in his *Conſtitution*, become *orthodoxall*, (though as it ſeemeth he remained in heart *hereticall*) hee fell into ſo great diſlike of thoſe who defended the *three Chapters*, that they [i] did *proclamare*, proclame him to be a colluder, a prevaricator or betrayer of the faith; one, who to pleaſe the Emperour revolted from his former judgement; yea the Africane [k] Biſhops proceeded ſo farre againſt him, that, as *Victor* Biſhop of *Tunen* teſtifieth, *Synodaliter eum à catholica communione recludunt, they in a Synod, and ſynodally excommunicated him*, or ſhut him from the Catholike communion. A thing worthy obſerving, being done by thoſe whom the Cardinall profeſſeth [l] to have beene Catholikes at that time. But let that paſſe: *Baronius* to excuſe [m] *Vigilius* from thoſe imputations of colluder and prevaricator, and to ſhew that hee was not in heart affected with the truth, which in his Conſtitution he declared, tells us a rare policy of the Pope, which for this time we omit, but hereafter will examine the truth and validity thereof, and this it was. *Mox* [n], preſently after *Vigilius* had made that *Apoſtolicall* decree for condemning the *three Chapters*, he revoked the ſame, (touched belike with remorſe for ſo hainous a crime, as to profeſſe the Catholike faith) and he ſuſpended it, and his owne judgement in that cauſe, till the time of a generall Councell: decreeing [o], that untill that time all men ſhould be whiſht and

i *Bar. an.* 547. *nu.* 49.
k *In Chron. an.* 10. *poſt Coſſ. Baſily.*
l *An.* 547 *nu.* 30. & 39.
m *Ad hæc omnia excuſanda, illud ſatis ſuperque eſt, Bar. ibi, nu.* 49.
n *An. eodem nu.* 41.
o *Rurſus a Vigilio promulgatum decretum eſt, quo decernebatur, ut de controverſia de tribus Capitulis penitus taceretur, ibid.*

and ſilent in this cauſe of faith; they muſt neither ſay that the *Three Chapters* were to bee defended, nor condemned; they muſt neither ſpeake one word for the truth, nor againſt the truth, they muſt all (during that time) be like himſelfe, lukewarme Laodiceans, neither hot nor cold, neither fiſh nor fleſh. This was the great wiſedome and policy of the Pope, as *Baronius* at large declares, and makes no ſmall boaſt thereof, adding [p] that the Pope remained in this mood till the time of the generall Councel. Thus you ſee the ſecond judgmẽt of Pope *Vigilius* in this cauſe, and his cariage during the ſecond period, for a fit (which perhaps laſted a weeke or a month) hee was in outward profeſſion *orthodoxall*, but being weary of ſuch an ague, hee preſently becomes a meere neutraliſt in the faith: and in this ſort hee continued till the aſſembling of the generall Councell, that is, for the ſpace of ſix yeares and more.

p *Ab hoc anno (547) ad tempus Concilij indictum (fuit autem an. 553) fuit in ea cauſa ſilentium, ibid. nu. 43.*

8. The third period begins at the time of the fift generall Councell: Of what judgement the Pope then was, it hath before [q] beene ſufficiently declared. Then *Vigilius* turned to his old byas, hee condemned the Emperours Edict, and all that with it condemned the *three Chapters*: he defends thoſe *three hereticall chapters*, and that after a moſt authenticall manner, publiſhing a Synodall, a Cathedrall and *Apoſtolicall conſtitution* in defence of the ſame. And whereas not only others, but himſelfe alſo, had written, and ſome ſixe yeares before, made a Conſtitution to condemne thoſe Chapters. Now after long and diligent ponderation of the cauſe, when hee had examined all matters, *cum omni undiq; cautela, with all warineſſe and circumſpection that could poſsible be uſed*: he quite caſheires, repeales, aud for ever adnuls [r] that former Conſtitution, and whatſoever either himſelfe or any other, either had before written or ſhould after that time, write contrary to this preſent Decree. And this no doubt was the reaſon why *Baronius* never ſo much as once endeavors to excuſe *Vigilius* by that former decree, or to prove him to have beene orthodoxall, by it: ſeeing by this later the whole force and vertue of that former is utterly made void, fruſtrate and of no effect in the world. In this judgement *Vigilius* was ſo reſolute, that hee was ready to endure any diſgrace and puniſhment, rather then conſent to the condemning of the *three Chapters*: and if wee may beleeve *Baronius* or *Binius*, he did for this very cauſe endure baniſhment. *It is manifeſt* ſaith *Binius* [s], *that after the end of the fift Councell Iuſtinian did caſt into baniſhment both* Vigilius *and other orthodoxall Biſhops*, (ſo hee termeth convicted and condemned heretikes) *becauſe they would not conſent to the decrees of the Synod, and condemning of the three Chapters*. In like ſort *Baronius* [t], *Liquet ex Anaſtaſio, it is manifeſt by Anaſtaſius, that* Vigilius *and thoſe who held with him were caried into baniſhment*. Againe [u], *Others thought they had a juſt quarrell in defending the three Chapters: when they ſaw* Vigilius *even in baniſhment to maintaine the ſame*, and they thought, *ſe pro ſacroſanctis pugnare legibus, that they fought for the holy faith*; when they ſaw Pope *Vigilius* himſelfe, for the ſame cauſe, *conſtanti animo exilium ferre, to endure baniſhment with a conſtant minde*. Againe [x], *Horum ſolum cauſa, for this cauſe onely was* Vigilius *driven into baniſhment, becauſe*

q *Sup. ca. 3. nu. 4. & ſeq.*

r *Si quid de eiſdem capitulis contra hæc quæ hic aſſeruimus... vel ſtatuimus factum, dictum atq; conſcriptum eſt, vel fuerit,... hoc modis omnibus ex authoritate ſedis Apoſtolicæ refutamus. Conſt. Vigil. in fine.*

s *Not. in Conc. 5. 5. Præſtitit.*

t *An. 553. nu. 222.*

u *Ibid. nu. 251.*

x *An. 554. nu. 6.*

cauſe he would not condemne the Three Chapters. So *Baronius*: who often calleth this exiling of *Vigilius* and others, who defended thoſe Chapters; perſecution [y], yea, an heavy [z] and monſtrous perſecution, complaining that the Church under *Iuſtinian* and from him, endured more hard conditions, and was in worſe caſe then under the Heathen Emperors.

y *Illi tantum immunes à perſecutione erant, &c. an. 553. nn. 222.*

z *Quod monſtroſius acceſſit, ab Imperatore perſecutio excitata eſt, & haud quidem levis. ibid. nn. 221.*

9. Now this demonſtrates that which before I touched, that though the Pope upon his comming to *Conſtantinople*, made a decree for condemning the *Three Chapters*, yet ſtill hee was in heart an affectionate lover of *Neſtorianiſme*, and a defender of thoſe Chapters, ſeeing for his love to them, and defence of them, he is ready not onely to bee bound, but to goe, and dye in baniſhment for his zeale unto them. For had he ſincerely embraced the truth, (as in his former Conſtitution he profeſſed,) why doth he now at the time of the fift Councell, diſclame the ſame? Of all times this was the fitteſt to ſtand conſtanly to the faith, ſeeing now both the glory of God, the good and peace of the Church, the authority of the Emperor, the exãple of orthodoxall Biſhops, and the whole Councell invited, urged, and provoked him to this holy duty. What was there or could there be to move him at this time, to defend the 3. *Chapters*, ſave only his ardent and inward love to *Neſtorianiſme*? Indeed had he continued in defence of thoſe Chapters untill this time; and now relented or changed his judgement, it would have bin vehemẽtly ſuſpected, that not the hatred of thoſe chapters, or of *Neſtorianiſme*, but either the favour of the Emperor, or the importunity of the Eaſterne Biſhops, or the feare of exile, or deprivation, or ſome ſuch puniſhment had extorted that ſentence and confeſſion from him: But now when hee decreeth contrary to the Emperour, to the generall Councell, and to his owne former and true judgement; when by publiſhing this *Decree*, he was ſure to gaine nothing, but the cenſure of an unconſtant and wavering minded man, the *Anathema* of the whole generall Councell, and the heavy indignation of the Emperor; when he goes thus againſt the maine current & ſtreame of the time, who can thinke, but that his onely motive to doe this, was his zeale and love to *Neſtorianiſme*? Love [a] (ſpecially of hereſie) is ſtrong as death. It will cauſe *Vigilius*, or any like him, when it hath once got poſſeſſion of their heart, with the *Baalites* and *Donatiſts*, to contemne launcing, whipping, and tearing of their fleſh; yea to delight as much in *Phalaris* Bull, as in a bed of doune, and in the midſt of all tortures to ſing with him in the Orator [b], *Quam ſuave eſt hoc? Quam nihil curo*? O how glad and merry a man am I, that ſuffer all theſe for the love of my *Three Chapters*? Loſſe of fame, loſſe of goods, loſſe of libertie, loſſe of my Countrey, loſſe of my pontificall See, loſſe of communion and ſociety of the Catholike Church, and of God himſelfe: Farewell all theſe, and all things elſe, rather then the *Three Chapters*, then *Neſtorianiſme* ſhall want a defender, or a Martyr to ſeale it with blood.

a *Cant. 8. 6.*

b *Tuſc. quæſt. lib. 2.*

10. You ſee now the third period, and the third judgement of Pope *Vigilius* in this cauſe. A judgement, which being delivered *ex Tripode*, and with all poſſible circumſpection, puts downe for many

reſpects both the former, what hee ſpake the firſt time in defence of theſe *Three Chapters*, was ſpoken in ſtomacke, and in his heat and choler againſt the Emperor. What he ſpake the ſecond time for condemning thoſe Chapters, he did therein but temporize and curry favour with the Emperor. But what he ſpake now this third time, after ſeven yeares ventilating of the cauſe, when all heat and paſſion being abated, he was in cold blood, and in ſuch a calme, that no perturbation did trouble his mind, or darken his judgement, that I ſay, proceeded from the very bottome of the hearr, and from the *Apoſtolicall* authority of his *infallible* Chaire, which to be a true and divine judgement, he like a worthy Confeſſor, ſealed with his baniſhment. And of this judgement hee continued in likelihood more, but as *Baronius* (whom I now follow) tels [c] us, about the ſpace of a yeare after the end of the fift Councell, even till hee returned out of exile unto *Conſtantinople*.

c *An.* 554. & 555.

11. The fourth and laſt changing of *Vigilius* was after his returne from baniſhment, as *Baronius* and *Binius* tell us. For while hee was there, he ſaw there was *urgentiſſima cauſa*, [d] a moſt urgent cauſe why he ſhould conſent to the Emperour, and approve the judgement of the holy Councell; and therefore hee was pleaſed once againe to make another *Apoſtolicall* [e] *Decree*, for adnulling his former Apoſtolicall judgement, and for condemning the *Three Chapters*, and confirming the fift Synod. *I thinke*, ſaith *Binius* [f], *that Vigilius confirmed the fift Synod by his Decree and Pontificall authority, and abrogated his former Conſtitution made in defence of the Three Chapters in the next yeare after the Councell was ended, when he being looſed from baniſhment, was ſuffered to returne into Italy, being adorned with ſundry gifts and priviledges*. Neither doth he only *opinari*, but he is certaine of it. *Dubium* [g] *non eſt*, *there is no doubt*, but *Vigilius* being delivered from exile, by the entreatie of *Narſes*, did confirme the fift Synod. *We thinke*, ſaith *Baronius*, *that* [h] *when* Vigilius *was by the intreaty of Narſes freed from exile, hee did then aſſent to the Emperour, and recalling his former ſentence, in his Conſtitution declared, did approve the fift Synod.* Againe [i], *Seeing we have declared, that* Vigilius *did not approve the fift Synod, when hee was driven into baniſhment, for he was exiled for no other cauſe, but for that hee would not approve that Synod: Neceſſe eſt affirmare, it muſt of neceſsity bee ſaid, that hee did this (approve the fift Synod;) at this time, when being looſed out of exile, he was ſent home to his owne Church.* So *Baronius*. Now ſeeing hee returned home after hee had obtained thoſe ample gifts and priviledges, which they ſo magnifie, and which are ſet downe in that pragmaticall ſanction of *Iuſtinian* [k], which was dated on the twelfth day of Auguſt, in the eight and twentieth yeare of his Empire: and the fift Councell was ended on the ſecond [l] day of Iune in his ſeven and twentieth yeare; it is cleare, that this his laſt change was made about an whole yeare after the end of the fift Councell, after hee had remained a yeare or thereabouts in baniſhment. And in this minde, as they [m] tell us, hee returned towards *Rome*, but by the way [n], while hee was yet but in *Sicily*, being afflicted with the ſtone, he dyed.

d *Bar. an.* 553. *nu.* 235.

e *Synodum 5. eadem Apoſtolica authoritate comprobaſſe ſatis apparet. Bar. an.* 554. *nu.* 7. & *Bini. loc. cit.* §. *Præſtitit.*

f *Ibid.*

g *Ibid.* §. *Tunc.*

h *An.* 554. *nu.* 4.

i *Ibidem.*

k *Extat in fine Novell.*

l *Conc.* 5. *coll.* 8.

m *Bar. & Bin. locis cit.*

n *Bar. an.* 555. *nu.* 2.

12. Here

12. Here is now the *Cataſtrophe* of the Popes turnings and returnings, and often changing in this cauſe of faith: Concerning which this is eſpecially to bee remembred, that whereas all the three former judgements of *Vigilius*, the firſt, when he defended thoſe three Chapters, being in *Italie*, the ſecond, when he condemned them upon his comming to *Conſtantinople*, and the third, when he againe defended them at the time of the Councell, and after, have all of them certaine and undeniable prooſes out of antiquitie, ſuch as the teſtimonies of *Facundus*, *Victor*, *Liberatus*, the Popes owne letters and Conſtitutions, together with the witneſſe of the Emperor, and the whole fift Councell; onely this laſt period, and this laſt change, when hee conſented to the fift Councell, and condemned the *Three Chapters*, This I ſay, which is the onely judgement whereby *Vigilius* is excuſed from hereſie, is utterly deſtitute of all ancient witneſſes, not any one that I can finde makes mention of this change, or of ought that can any way enforce the ſame, and therefore this may and muſt be called the *Baronian* change or Period, he being the firſt man, that I can learne of, who ever mentioned or dreamed of this change. And although this alone were ſufficient to oppoſe to all that the Cardinall or any other can hence collect in excuſe of *Vigilius*, reaſon and equitie forbidding us to bee too credulous upon the Cardinals bare word, (which even in this one cauſe touching the Three Chapters, and this fift Councell, beſides many the like, demonſtratively to be proved untrue and falſe, I ſpeake it confidently and within compaſſe, in ſix hundreth ſayings at the leaſt) yet that they may not ſay wee decline the force of this ſo pregnant an exception, we will for a little while admit and ſuppoſe it to bee true, and try, whether by this being yeelded unto them, there can accrew any advantage to their cauſe, or any help to excuſe either *Vigilius* himſelfe, or his *Conſtitution* ſet forth in defence of the *Three Chapters*, from being hereticall.

13. Say you *Vigilius* by his laſt decree confirmed the fift Councell and approved the Catholike faith? Be it ſo, we deny not but that *Vigilius*, or any other of their Popes may decree, and have decreed a truth, thats not the doubt betwixt us and them. The queſtion is, whether any of their Popes have at any time by his *Cathedrall* authoritie, and teaching, as Popes, decreed an hereſie, or untruth. That Pope *Vigilius* did ſo, his *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution* in defence of the *Three Chapters*, is an eternall witnes againſt them, a monument *ære perennius*, Had *Baronius* ſaid that *Vigilius* never decreed the defending of thoſe Chapters, he had fully cleared him in this matter, if he could have proved what he had ſaid. But ſeeing undeniable records teſtifie, and the Cardinall himſelfe with a Stentors voice proclameth, this to be the true and undoubted *Conſtitution* of Pope *Vigilius*, though hee had revoked and repealed it a thouſand times, yet can not this quit his former *Apoſtolicall* Decree from being *hereticall*, nor excuſe their pontificall chaire from being *fallible*. It is nothing at all materiall which of the Popes Cathedrall Decrees, the firſt, laſt, or middle bee *hereticall*: If any one of them all bee: wee deſire no more, the field is wonne.

14. Say you *Vigilius* by an *Apoſtolicall decree*, confirmed the fift Councell? Then did hee certainely decree that all writings defending the *Three Chapters*, doe defend hereſie: and that all perſons who defend thoſe Chapters, for ſo long time as they defend them, after the judgement of that Councell, are convicted and condemned hereticks. Then the former *Conſtitution* of Pope *Vigilius*, ſet forth by his *Apoſtolicall* authoritie in the time of the Councell, in defence of thoſe Chapters, is now by Popes *Vigilius* himſelfe and by his *Apoſtolicall* authority and *infallible* Chaire declared to bee *hereticall*; and *Vigilius* himſelfe for that yeare after the Councell, is now by *Vigilius* himſelfe pronounced to bee an Hereticke; yea a definer of hereſie, *Vigilius* now orthodoxal decreeth himſelfe to have been before heretical. Nay it further followeth, that by confirming that Councell, hee confirmeth, and that by an *Apoſtolicall* and *infallible Decree*, that all who defend the Popes *Cathedrall* ſentence in cauſes of faith, to bee *infallible*, are convicted and accurſed heretickes, for by defending that poſition, they do *eo ipſo* defend that Conſtitutiõ of *Vigilius* made in defence of the *Three Chapters* to bee true, infallible, and orthodoxall, which *Vigilius* himſelfe by an infallible decree hath declared to bee erroneous, and hereticall. So far is this laſt and *Baronian* change from excuſing *Vigilius* in this cauſe, that upon the admiſſion thereof it doth inevitably enſue, both that *Vigilius* was an hereticke and a definer of hereſie, and that all who defend the Popes Cathedrall *infallibitie*, in cauſes of faith, that is, al who are members of their preſent Romane Church, to bee not onely heretickes, and for ſuch condemned and accurſed, but defenders alſo of a condemned and accurſed hereſie, even by the infallible judgement and decree of Pope *Vigilius*.

15. Their whole reaſon whereby *Vigilius* might bee excuſed, being now fully diſſolved; There remaineth one point, which *Baronius*, and after him *Binius*, obſerveth, touching this often changing of *Vigilius*: which being a point of ſpeciall note, I ſhould wrong both *Vigilius* and *Baronius* if I ſhould over-paſſe the ſame. Some men when they heare of theſe often changings, windings, and turnings of Pope *Vigilius* in this cauſe of faith, and of his baniſhment for defending a condemned hereſie, will perhaps imagine this to bee a token of ſome levitie, unconſtancie, or folly in the Pope. O fie! It was not ſo, ſaith [o] *Baronius*; *What hee did was not onely lawfull* [p], *done by good right and reaſon, but it was laudable alſo, done with great* [q] *adviſe, wiſedome, and conſideration. Vigilius, a man of* [r] *greateſt conſtancie; One who ſtood* [s] *up with courage for defence of the Church, adverſus violentum eccleſiæ graſſatorem, againſt Iuſtinian, a violent oppreſſor thereof: one* [t] *who fought for the ſacred lawes, enduring exile, conſtanti animo, with a conſtant minde for the ſame. One who did by this meanes wiſely* [u], *yea, prudentiſſimè, moſt wiſely provide for the good of the Church. One who in thus doing did wiſely* [x] *imitate* Saint *Paul, who condemned circumciſion, and yet when hee circumciſed Timothie, approved circumciſion.* And though there bee a marvellous diſſimilitude in their actions, the one change being in a mutable, &, at that time, an indifferent ceremonie, the other being in an immutable doctrine of faith; Yet thus do they pleaſe themſelves, and

o *Cum ſæpe ſententiâ mutavit, haud arguendus eſt levitatis. an. 553. nu. 235.*

p *Cur ei nõ licuit mutato rerum ſtatu mutare ſententiam? ibid. nu. 231, &, jure meritoque mutavit ſententiam. Bin. §. Cum igitur.*

q *Vigilius magna conſideratione adhibita atque prudentiâ, diverſo modo pugnabat. an. 547. nu. 50.*

r *Summa conſtantiæ ſpecimen edidit. ibid. nu. 49.*

s *An. 551. nu. 5.*

t *An. 553. nu. 251.*

u *An. 547. nu. 41.*

x *Prudẽs & pius pontifex hac in re prudenter eſt imitatus S. Paulum. Bin. in Edict. nu. 11. to. 2. pa. 499. §. Cum, & Bar. an. 553. nu. 235.*

and applaud the Pope in theſe his wiſe and worthy changes.

16. Now in ſtead of a better concluſion to this Chapter, I will entreate the reader to obſerve with me two things touching their commending *Vigilius* in this manner. The former is, what an happie thing it is to be a Pope, or have a Cardinall for his ſpokeſman. Let *Luther*, *Cranmer*, or a Proteſtant make farre leſſe change thē did *Vigilius*, what ſhall they not heare? An Apoſtate, unconſtant, inconſiderate, a Chamelion, a Polipus, another Proteus, even *Vertumnus* himſelfe. Let the Pope ſay and gaineſay the ſame doctrine of faith, and then *ex Cathedra* define both his ſayings being contradictorie, to bee not onely true, but *infallible* truths of the Catholike faith: O, It is all done with rare wiſdome, with great reaſon, and conſideration, The Pope in all this deales wiſely, and that in the ſuperlative degree. If when he is abſent from the Emperor, he oppugne the truth publiſhed by the Emperors edict, It is wiſely done; Kings and Emperors may not make Lawes in cauſes of faith, no not for the faith; The Cobler muſt not goe beyond his latchet. If when hee is brought before the Emperor, he ſing a new ſong, and ſay juſt as the Emperor ſaith, *Ait, aio: Negat, nego:* It is wiſely done, *principibus placuiſſe viris*, for the Kings wrath is the meſſenger of death. If after both theſe bee become a meere Neutraliſt and Ambodexter in faith, holding communion with all ſides, Catholikes, heretickes, and all, this is alſo an act of rare wiſdome, the Pope is now become another Saint *Paul*, *factus eſt omnia omnibus*, with Catholikes he's a Catholike, that he may gaine Catholikes, with Heretickes, he's an Hereticke, that he may gaine heretickes, he's all with all, that hee may gaine them all. If when the Emperor, the generall Councell, the whole Church calls for his reſolution in a cauſe of faith, if then hee ſtep into his *infallible* Chaire, and thence by his *Apoſtolicall* authoritie define, that the *three Chapters*, that is, that Neſtorianiſme ſhall for ever bee held for the Catholike faith, O wiſely done, he now drops oracles from heaven, *in Cathedra ſedet*, the voice of God, and not of man. If, when hee is baniſhed for his obſtinacie againſt the truth, upon ſome urgent cauſe which then he diſcernes, he calls againe for his holy Trevir, and thence decrees the quite contradictorie to his former *Apoſtolicall* ſentence, In this he's wiſer then in all the reſt: for by this he ſhews that he's more wiſe and powerfull then all the Prophets and Apoſtles ever were; They ſilly men could make but the one part of a contradiction to be true, but the Pope he is *tanto* [y] *potentior Prophetis, ſo much more wiſe and powerfull then all the Prophets*, that hee can make both parts of a contradiction to be *infallible* truths; and unto which of the Prophets was it ever ſaid, *Tu es Petra*? But the Pope is a Rocke indeed, a Rocke upon which you may build two contradictories in the doctrine of faith, and in them both ſay unto him, *Tu es Petra*. Such a Rocke neither the Prophets, nor Apoſtles, nor Chriſt himſelfe ever was. So wiſe, ſo exceeding wiſe is the Pope, in all his turnings, even as wiſe as a wethercocke for turning with the wind and weather.

[y] *Tanto ipſe potentior eſt Prophetis effectus, quanto differentius præ illis nomen hæreditavit. Nam cui prophetarum aliquando dictū eſt, Tu es Petra? Bar. an. 552. nu. 9.*

17. Againe, when the Pope, his inſtruments or Inquiſitors (to whom *Phalaris*, *Buſiris*, and all the heathen perſecutors may yeeld) exerciſe

exerciſe againſt us for maintaining the truth of God, all exquiſite & helliſh tortures (to which the old heatheniſh were but *ludus & jocus*) all which they doe muſt be extolled as due punishments, and juſt cenſures of the Holy Father of the holy Church, of the Holy inquiſition, of the Holy houſe, all muſt bee covered with the mantle of holineſſe. On the other ſide, when they reſiſt the moſt religious lawes, or Edicts of Kings or Emperors, when *Vigilius* or any of them (being by an holy generall Councell declared, and condemned for an Hereticke,) are for their obſtinate rebellion againſt the truth juſtly puniſhed, though *Iuſtinian* yea Iuſtice it ſelfe, ſhall uſe rather moderate then ſevere correction againſt them; they forſooth muſt be accoumpted catholikes: Cõfeſſers, & holy Martyrs, ſuch as ſuffer for religion, for the ſacred lawes, and for the Catholike faith; but *Iuſtinian* the Defender of the faith, muſt be called *Iulian*, Iuſtice be termed *Scelus* [z]; and the Church for that cauſe ſaid to bee in farre worſe condition, then in the times of *Nero*, *Diocleſian*, or any of the heathen Tyrants. Such an happie thing it is to bee a Pope, or Papiſt; for then their wavering ſhall be Conſtancie; their rebellion, Religion and fortitude: their folly, greate and rare wiſedome: their hereſie, Catholike doctrine: and their moſt condigne puniſhments ſhall be crowned with Martyrdome.

[z] *Vidiſti Scelus, &c. Bar. an. 554. nu. 2.*

18. The other thing which I obſerve, is, what a ſtrong faith, Papiſts had need to have, who rely upon the Popes judgement, which changeth out and in, in and out ſo many times: who yet are bound to beleeve al the Pope *definitive* ſentences in cauſes of faith, that is, to ſpeake in plaine tearmes, who are bound to beleeve two contradictories to bee both true, both of them the infallible oracles of God. Or if any of them have ſo weake a faith, that he can but beleeve the one, I would gladly learne of ſome who is an *Oedipus* among them, In this caſe of two Contradictorie *Cathedrall* decrees, ſuch as were theſe of Pope *Vigilius*, whether of the Popes definitive judgements, that is, according to their language, whether of the ſayings of God is true, and whether falſe, or what ſtrength the one hath, more then the other. If the Apoſtolicall ſentence of *Vigilius* delivered *cum omni undique cautela*, and by his Cathedrall authoritie, in defence of the *Three Chapters*, be repealeable by a ſecond, why may not the ſecond (which cannot poſſibly have more authoritie) bee repealed by a third, and the third by a fourth, and fourth by a fift, and ſo *in Infinitum*? If the Pope after ſeaven yeares deliberation and ventilating of the cauſe, while hee is all that time in peace, and libertie, may be deceived in his judiciall and Cathedrall ſentence in a cauſe of faith, how may wee be aſſured, that when ſome yeares after that, the tediouſneſſe of exile and deſire of his priſtine libertie and honour perſwades him to make a contrary decree, he may not therein alſo bee deceived? If the Popes decrees made in libertie, peace and proſperity be of force, why ſhall not the decree of *Vigilius* in defence of the *Three Chapters*, be an article of faith? If thoſe free decrees may be admitted by a ſtronger ſentence when the Pope is in baniſhment, how may any beleeve their *Laterane* and *Trent* decrees, as doctrines of faith? For why may there not once

againſt

againe, come ſome other *Iuſtinian*, into the world, (as great pitie it is but there ſhould) who in theſe, or future times may miniſter that ſoveraigne medicine to cleare the Popes judgement, and reſtraine, or cloſe him up in ſome meaner eſtate, and farre lower place, whence, as out of a darke and low pit, he may diſcerne thoſe cœleſtiall truths in the Word of God, like ſo many Starres in heaven, which now being invironed with the circumfuſed ſplendor of the Romane Court, he cannot poſſibly behold. If thoſe *Three Chapters* were to bee condemned, why did the Pope defend them at the time of the Councell? If they were to be defended, why did he condemne them after his returne from exile? Nay, if the *Three Chapters* were *orthodoxall*, why did the Pope at any time firſt or laſt by his *Apoſtolicall* ſentence condemne them? If they were *hereticall*, why did he at any time, firſt or laſt, by his *Cathedrall* and *Apoſtolicall* ſentence defend them? I confeſſe I am here in a Labyrinth; if any of the Cardinals friends will winde mee out, he ſhall for ever be *Theſeus* unto me.

CAP. XVI.

That the Decree *of* Vigilius *for* Taciturnity touching the Three Chapters, *and the Councell, wherein it is ſuppoſed to be made, and all the* Conſequents upon that Decree, *painted out by* Baronius, *are all fictitious, and Poeticall.*

1. THE whole reaſon of *Baronius* drawne from *Vigilius* his confirming of the fift Councell, being now fully diſſolved, we might without further ſtay, and I gladly would, according to my intended order in the Treatiſe, proceed to his next exceptiõ: but there are two points in this laſt paſſage, touching the chãgings of *Vigilius*, which, even againſt my will, pull mee backe, and call me to examine what *Baronius* ſets downe, and with exceeding oſtentation paints out, in his Annals, concerning them; the due conſideration whereof will cauſe any man to admire the Cardinals moſt audacious, and ſhameleſſe dealing in Synodall affaires, and cauſes of the Church: The one of them concernes the ſecond, the other the fourth period in *Vigilius* changings. The former is this.

2. As ſoone as the defenders of the *Three Chapters* had notice of that Iudiciall ſentence, and *Decree* publiſhed by *Vigilius* againſt the ſame Chapters, upon his comming to *Conſtantinople*, they began to ſtorme thereat, and condemne *Vigilius* [a] as a Prevaricator, or revolter from the faith; whereupon *Vigilius*, as the Cardinall tels us, put in practice a rare peece of wiſedome [b], and of his Pontificall pollicy; *ſententiam emiſſam* [c] *mox ſuſpendit, ſeu potius revocavit; he ſuſpends and revokes that his late judgement; & rurſum ab eo promulgatum decretum, quo decernebatur ut penitus taceretur; and he publiſhed a new Decree, wherein he decreed, that every man ſhould be ſilent*, and ſay never a word, either *pro*,

a *Ibid. ipſum (Vigilium) colluſorem, prævaricatoremque ab adverſarijs cõclamatum.* Bar. an. 547. nu. 49.
b *Prudenter periclitanti Eccleſiæ viſus eſt conſuluiſſe Vigilius.* Ibid. nu. 41.
c *Ibid.*

pro, or *contra*, touching that queſtion of the *Three Chapters*, till the time of the generall Councel, from [d] this yeare (which was the 21 [e] of *Iuſtinian*, & the ſame wherin *Vigilius* came to *Conſtantinople*) until the time of the generall Councell, *in eâ cauſâ ab ipſo* Vigilio *indictũ fuit Silentiũ*; *Silence was injoyned every man in that cauſe, by Pope* Vigilius: & againe [f], *Tacendũ indixit, he injoyned Silence in that cauſe*; and very often doth the Cardinall, with no ſmall comfort, mention this Decree of *Taciturnity*. And, for the more ſolemnitie of the matter, *Vigilius* decreed this in a Councell, it was not onely his, but, *decretum* [g] *Synodi*, the decree of a Councell, together with the Pope. Vigilius [h] *Synodicè ſtatuit tacendum eſſe*; Vigilius *decreed in, and with a Synod, that there ſhould be a Silence in this cauſe*, untill the generall Councell: To which Synodall decree, not onely *Mennas* [i], and *Theodorus* Biſhop of *Ceſarea*, but [k] *Iuſtinian* himſelfe alſo conſented, and promiſed to obſerve the ſame. This was the Decree; ſee now the effects, and Cõſequents which enſued thereupon, declared alſo by *Baronius*.

3. This Decree tooke ſo good effect at the firſt, that, *res aliquandiu conſopita* [l] *ſiluit*, for a ſpace, all matters, touching the *Three Chapters*, were huſht aſleepe, not a word ſpoken of that Controverſie: But ſome foure yeares [m] after the publiſhing thereof, when *Vigilius* ſaw divers contrary to his decree, to condemne the *Three Chapters*, [n] *erigit ſe, he rouzeth up himſelfe for defence thereof*, and [o] excommunicated *Mennas* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, *Theodorus* Biſhop of *Ceſarea*, and many moe; and this alſo he did in another Councell conſiſting of thirteene [p] Biſhops beſides himſelfe. Yea and whereas the Emperour in that yeare publiſhed, or hung out his Edict againſt the ſame Chapters contrary to his owne promiſe, and the Decree for *Taciturnity*, the Pope withſtood him ſo long, and ſo eagerly, that *Iuſtinian* began to rage, to uſe threats, and violence againſt him, ſo that the Pope, *in* [r] *fugam tantum ſpem poſuit*, was forced to flee from him out of the [s] houſe where he dwelled, called (for good lucke ſake) *Platidiana*, unto the Church of Saint *Peter*, where he remained a time, *in adverſarios ſententiam ferens*; *thundering out his cenſures againſt his adverſaries*. But that ſacred place [t] could be no Sanctuary for *Vigilius*; they buffeted [u] and beate him on his face; they called him an homicide, a murderer of *Sylverius*, and of the widowes ſonne: whereupon hee, to avoid the fury [x] and violence of the ſacrilegious Emperour, fled [y] from *Conſtantinople* to *Chalcedon*, and there lived in the Church of Saint *Euphemia*, taking hold of a Piller or Horne of the Altar: And even there, though in perſecution, and affliction, he bated [z] not one Ace of his *Apoſtolicall* authority; but, as if he had lived in peace, and beene in the *Laterane* or *Vaticane*, he aſcends into his *Apoſtolike* Throne [a], and high Tribunall; and thence, by the fulneſſe of his *Apoſtolicall* power, he [b] throwes out his darts, repreſſeth and proſtrateth his adverſaries; pronounceth

d *Ab hoc anno, ad illud uſque tempus. Ibid. nu.* 43.
e Bar *ibid. nu.* 26
f *Ibid. nu.* 48
g Bar. *an.* 551. *nu.* 2.
h *Ibid. nu.* 3.
Bar. *an.* 547. *nu.* 43.
k *Iuſtinianus contra præcedentis Synodi decretũ, et emiſſam ſponſionem de ſervando uſq; ad Concilium univerſale ſilẽtio, appendi juſſit Edictum.* Bar. *an.* 551. *nu.* 2.
l Bar. *an.* 547. *nu.* 41.
m *Nam decretũ editum an.* 547. Bar. *eo an. nu.* 43. *iſta autem geſta an.* 551 Bar. *eo an. nu.* 2. 5, 6. *et ſeq.*
n Bar. *an.* 551. *nu.* 5.
o *Sententiam excommunicationis interquet. Ibid. Verba excõmunicationis extant. Ibid. nu.* 11 *et* 12.
p *Ibid. nu.* 11.
q *Iuſtinianus contra Synodi decretum publicè appendi juſſit Edictum. Ibid. nu.* 2.
r *Ibid. et confugere coactus eſt. An.* 552. *nu.* 8.
ſ Bar. *an.* 551. *nu.* 2.
t *Nec ſacer ille locus aſylum tanto Pontifici fuit. An.* 552. *nu.* 8.
u *Dedit alapam in faciem, &c. Ibid.*
x *Ab Imperatoris furore; & ab Imperatoris ſacrilegi violentia. Ibid.*
y *Trans mare quæſivit effugium, et in Baſilicam S. Euphemiæ apud Chalcedonem habitare diſpoſuit. An.* 552. *nu.* 8.
z *Nihil penitus remiſit Apoſtolicæ authoritatis. Ibid. nu.* 9. *et* 10.
a *Idem ille locus effectus eſt, Pontificis Romani præſentia, eminens tunc̃iſque perſpicuum ad judicandum tribunal, &c. Ibid. nu.* 10.
b *Miſſilia in hoſtes jacit, potentiſſimaque ſpiritalia ſpicula jacit in hoſtes feritque. Ibid.*

ſentence

ſentence [c] againſt Biſhops, yea, againſt a Patriarch; adnulleth the acts of the Emperour, knowing his authoritie to be greater than that Prophets was, to whom God ſaid [d], *I have ſet thee above Nations and kingdomes.*

4. Now behold a miracle [e] indeed; by fleeing away, *Vigilius* overcommeth, by being perſecuted hee is victorious; all humane power, even hell gates, doth, and muſt yeeld to him: For the Emperor underſtanding that he was fled away, repented [f] him of that which hee had done againſt the Pope, and therefore ſent meſſengers to recall him from *Chalcedon*, and thoſe not ordinary ſouldiers, *ſed dignam tanto Pontifice legationem; but honourable embaſſadours, worthy the eſtate of ſo great a Biſhop*, who ſhould aſſure him, even upon their oathes [g], that he ſhould be honorably received. But, ſo ſtout, nay, magnanimous, was the Pope, and ſo very circumſpect and wiſe [h], as, remembring the proverbe, *Græcorum fides*, that he would neither come out of the Church, nor beleeve [i] the meſſengers, though ſwearing unto him, unleſs the Emperour would preſently recall and aboliſh his Edicts againſt the *Three Chapters*. The Emperour yeelded [k] to all that the Pope preſcribed; yea, *conſtat ceßiſſe*, it is certaine and evident, that he ſubmitted himſelfe to the Popes pleaſure, and that *penitus* in every point: hee commands the Edicts, which hee had publiſhed, to be taken away, to bee removed; *& ea ſententia* [l] Vigilii, *quod fecerat, abrogavit*; and according to *Vigilius* direction, he abrogated what before he had done. Nor onely did the Emperour repent, but *Theodorus* [l] alſo, and *Mennas*, they came and offered, *libellum ſupplicem* Vigilio, *a booke of ſupplication to intreat* Vigilius, that he would be appeaſed towards them, and crying, *Peccavi, ſuppliciter* [m] *veniam petunt*; *they beſeech him in a ſuppliant manner to forgive their* [n] *offence*. Oh how admirable is this in our eyes! the Rocke which the builders refuſed, is now laid againe in the head of the Corner; and thoſe Princes and Prelates which oppoſed themſelves to the Pope, doe now ſubmit, ſupplicate, and yeeld themſelves unto him. The Pope [o], after this ſo ample ſatisfaction, was pleaſed to be reconciled to them all, and admitted them into his communion; & ſo the ſtorme of perſecutiõ being paſt, the Church injoyned tranquillity, the Pope was brought againe with great joy from *Chalcedon* to *Conſtantinople*: For the joy [p] and ſolemnity whereof *Mennas* that ſame yeare (which was the 26 [q] of *Iuſtinian*, and next before the generall Councell) celebrated a feaſt of the *Encænia*, or dedication of the Church, of three Apoſtles, *Andrew*, *Luke*, and *Timothy*, and the holy reliques [r] of their bodies being then found, *Mennas* carried them round about the City in a Chariot of Gold, and then laid them up in the Church: After all which, *Mennas*, in the peace of the Church, and communion with *Vigilius*, in an happy manner gave up the ghoſt: and

c *Summa patefactæ plenitudine adverſus metropolitanos Epiſcopos, imò in ipſum Patriarchum Conſtantinopolitanum fere ſententiam, inſuper et perpetuam facta Imperatoris reſcindere magno animo aggreſſus eſt. An. 552. nu. 9.*

d *Jer. 1.*

e *Ita plane magno veluti miraculo factum eſt, &c. Ibid. nu. 11.*

f *Iuſtinianus facti panitens dignam tanto Pontifice legationem ornavit, &c. Ibid.*

g *Iuramento præſtito honorifice revocaret. Ibid.*

h *Nuncijs licet magna pollicentibus haud putavit eſſe credendum, utpote (quod in proverbio eſt) Græcorum fides. Bar. 552. nu. 12.*

i *Neque juratis patricijs voluit fidem adhibere, niſi Imperator quæ contra Rom. Pontificis de tribus Capitulis appendiſſet Edicta protenus revocaret, atque penitus aboleret. Ibid. nu. 11.*

k *Conſtat ceſſiſſe tandem Vigilio Imperatorem, atque appenſa amoveri juſſiſſe a ſe prolata de tribus Capitulis Edicta, &c.*

Ibid. an. 552. nu. 15. et, Imperator appenſa antea de tribus Capitulis tolli juſſit Edicta. Ibid. nu. 19. l *Ibid. an. 552. nu. 19.* l *Theodorus facti panitens ad eum accedens humilis libellum ſupplicem ipſi Vigilio offert. Ibid. an. 552. nu. 19. Præſtitit id ipſum etiam Mennas, Ibid. nu. 20.* m *Ibid. nu. 19.* n *Quis iſta conſiderans non miretur, atque obſtupeſcat, &c. Ibid. nu. 20.* o *Tali promiſſa ſatisfactione, Vigilius eoſdem in communionem accepit, redditaque eſt Eccleſiæ pax. Ibid. nu. 20.* p *Hoc ipſo anno (552) Mennas Conſt. Epiſcopus à Vigilio in communionem admiſſus Encænia celebravit, &c. Bar. ibid. an. 552. nu. 22.* q *Anno hoc 552. exordio menſis Aprilis incipit numerari Juſtiniani annus 26.* r *Cum ſacræ reliquiæ auro aureo circumvectæ ab eodem Menna reſondite ſunt. Bar. Ibid. nu. 22.* (Bar. an. 552. nu. 23.

[t] Sic itaq; animis junctis, restitutoque in pristinã dignitatem atq; honorem Vigilio, indicta est Synodus, &c. Bar. an. 553. nu. 14.

so the Pope [t] being restored to his former dignitie, *animis junctis, their mindes being joyned together*; the generall Counceil, long wished for by *Vigilius*, was summoned against the moneth of *May*, in the twenty seventh yeare of *Iustinian*. This is the summe of the narration of *Baronius*, touching the Decree of *Taciturnity*, and the manifold consequents thereof.

5. Concerning which, none I thinke can judge otherwise, but that *Baronius*, as he is miserably infatuated in this whole cause of the *Three Chapters*; so, in this passage, hee was growne to that extremity of dotage, that hee seemes utterly to have beene bereft, both of common sense, and reason: For I doe constantly avouch, that in no part of all this his narration, (which, as you see, is very large and copious, and runneth, like a great streame, through divers yeares in *Baronius* Annals) there is any truth at al. No such Decree of *Taciturnity*, ever made by *Vigilius*; no Synod wherein it was decreed; no assent, either of *Mennas*, or *Theodorus*, or the Emperour unto it; no violating of that Decree by *Mennas*, or *Theodorus*; no excommunication of them, or other Bishops, for doing contrary to it; no hanging up of the Emperours Edict after it; no resistance made by *Vigilius* against the Emperour; no persecuting of *Vigilius*, no buffeting of him, no objecting of murder unto him; no fleeing either to Saint *Peters* Church, or to *Chalcedon*; no thundring out from thence of his Pontificall Censures; no embassage sent from the Emperour to call him thence; no such magnanimitie in *Vigilius* as to refuse to returne; no recalling, or abrogating of the Emperiall Edict by the Emperour; no submission of *Mennas*, or *Theodorus* to the Pope; no solemnizing of the *Encænia* for those three Apostles at that time by *Mennas*; no carying of those holy reliques in a triumphing manner, and in a golden Chariot; no laying them up by *Mennas*; and, in a word, in that whole passage of *Baronius*, there is not so much as one dramme, nor one syllable of truth. The Cardinall from an Historian is here quite metamorphozed into a Poet, into a Fabler, and in stead of writing Annals, matters of fact, and reall truths, he guls his readers with fictitious, anile, and more than *Æsopicall* fables.

6. For the clearing whereof I will begin with the Decree it selfe, which is the ground of the whole fiction, and therefore if it bee demonstrated to bee but an idle dreame and fancie, all the rest, which hang on it like so many consequents, and appendices, will of themselves fall to the ground. Nor doe I speake to disgrace this Decree, as if *Baronius* could gaine ought thereby, though it were admitted and granted unto him: For alas, what a poore pollicy or peece of wisedome was this in the Pope, being a Iudge *infallible*, to command, and decree by his *Apostolicall* authority, that for five or sixe, or, as it might have hapned, for forty or sixty yeares together, no man should speake a word in this cause of faith, neither condemne the *three Chapters*, nor defend the same; which is in effect, that they should neither speake against, nor for Nestorianisme; neither dare to say, that Christ is God, nor, that he is not God, but suspend their judgement in them both; that for all that time none should either be Catholikes, or heretikes,

but

but be like *Vigilius*, meere Neutraliſts in the faith, what other wiſdome is this but that of the *Laodiceans*, which Chriſt condemneth [u]? *I would thou werſt either hot or cold, but becauſe thou art neither hot nor cold, it will come to paſſe that I will ſpue thee out of my mouth*: what other then that which *Elias* reproves [x]? *Why halt yee betweene two opinions? If the Lord be God follow him, but if Baal, or Neſtorianiſme, be he, goe after it.* By this Decree of Taciturnity *Vigilius* provideth that neither himſelfe nor others ſhould ſpeake againſt the truth or condemne it. True, but that is not enough; He ſhould have defended it alſo, and cauſed others by his inſtruction and example to doe the like. A neutraliſt, *one that is not* [y] *with Chriſt, is againſt Chriſt*: Hee that is not with the truth is againſt the truth. Silence where God commands to ſpeake, is betraying of Gods truth. If the Heathen wiſe man [z] ſet this, and that juſtly among his eternall lawes; That he who in a publike diviſion of the Common-wealth, tooke part with neither ſide, ſhould bee puniſhed with loſſe of goods and baniſhment; how much more ought this to take place in *Vigilius*, and all ſuch *Metij Suffetij*, who in the publike rent of the Church, and that for a cauſe of faith, will be of neither part, neither for God nor againſt him? Nay if we well conſider, even for this very decree of ſilence, *Vigilius* is to bee judged an heretike, for the whole Councell of *Chalcedon* condemned *Domnus* Patriarch of *Antioch* as an Heretike, onely for this cauſe [a], for that hee writ that men ſhould bee ſilent, and ſay nothing of the twelve Chapters of *Cyrill*, as both *Iuſtinian* and the fift Councell [b] doe teſtifie. Did not *Vigilius*, if the Cardinall ſay true, teach, nay decree the very like ſilence concerning the *Three Chapters*, as *Domnus* did concerning thoſe twelve of *Cyrill*? Theſe Three doe as nearly concerne the faith, as did the other twelve. Theſe three were as certainly condemned by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, as the other twelve were approved by the Councell of *Epheſus*. As *Domnus* by teaching ſilence in thoſe of *Cyrill*, even thereby taught that men ſhould not allow them, nor ſay that they might be allowed, and therein overthrew the faith of the Epheſine Councell, which approved them, and taught all men to approve them: Even ſo, *Vigilius* by decreeing ſilence in theſe *Three Chapters*, decreeth that none ſhall condemne them, or ſay they are to be condemned, and ſo overthroweth the Catholike faith which was declared at *Chalcedon*, whereby they are all three condemned, and taught that they ought to bee condemned. If the teaching of ſilence in the one can make *Domnus* an heretike, certainly the decreeing of ſilence in the other, cannot chuſe but make *Vigilius* an heretike. O but this decree was to continue but for a time, *Vigilius* would expect the aſſembling of a generall Councell, and then he would reſolve the matter to the full. And you have ſeen how well he reſolved it then. But what? Expect a Councell? why is not his Holineſſe able to decide a doubt in faith, without a generall Councell? Is he not of himſelfe infallible? Doth his infallibilitie like an Ague goe away, and come by fits upon him? Is the generall Councel that Angel which muſt move the Poole in the Popes breſt, before he can teach infallibly? The Pope ſcornes to hold his infallibility

[u] *Apoc.* 3. 15, 16.

[x] 1 *King.* 18. 21.

[y] *Matth.* 12. 30.

[z] *Solonis lex apud A. Gellium lib.* 2. *ca.* 12.

[a] *Chalcedonenſis S. Synodus Domnum condemnavit, quod auſus eſt ſcribere, oportere ſolum tacere* 12. *Capitula S. Cyrilli. Iuſt. in Ædict.* §. *Quod autem.*

[b] *Idem aſſerit plane Conc.* 5. *Col.* 6. *pa.* 575. *b*

precario, by the curteſie either of the whole Church, or of any generall Councell: He is all-ſufficient in himſelfe, he gives to them *infallibility*, he receives none from them; what thinke you then was become of *Vigilius* his infallibility, that for deciding a doubt in faith, hee muſt ſuſpend all in ſilence, and ſtay till the generall Councel be aſſembled, which, for ought he knew, might bee 60. or 100. yeares after? If of himſelfe he was infallible, why did he hold men in ſuſpence in the doctrine of faith? why did he not preſently, and without the Councell infallibly decide it, and ſo ſet the Church at quiet? If of himſelfe he was not infallible, how could he at the time of the Councell infallibly decide it? for they make not him or his ſentence infallible, but all their infallibility is borrowed from him. So little helpe is there for them in this decree of taciturnity, (if wee ſhould admit thereof) that in very deed, it doth many wayes prejudice their cauſe. It is not then the preventing of any advantage which hence they might have, that cauſeth me to reject this decree, but the onely love of the truth perſwadeth, nay enforceth me hereunto. For I profeſſe I was not a little moved to ſee the Cardinalls Annalls ſo ſtuffed with untruths and figments, and ſee him alſo not onely by theſe to abuſe, and that moſt vilely, his Readers, but even to vaunt and glory (as you have ſeene hee doth) in that which is, and will be an eternall ignominy unto him. But let us come to make evident the fiction of this Decree.

7. That *Vigilius* made no ſuch decree of *Taciturnitie*, firſt the Emperor *Iuſtinian* in his Letters to the fift generall Councell is a witnes above exception, *When Pope* Vigilius, ſaith he [c], *was come to this our Princely City, we did accurately manifeſt unto him all things touching theſe three Chapters, and we demanded of him what he thought hereof: and he not once or twiſe, but often in writing, without writing, did anathematize the ſame Chapters. Quod vero ejuſdem voluntatis ſemper fuit de condemnatione trium Capitulorum, per plurima declaravit, and that he hath alwayes,* (ever ſince his comming hither) *continued in the ſame minde of condemning thoſe three Chapters, he hath very many wayes declared.* And after, repeating ſome of thoſe particulars, hee adds, *Et compendioſe dicere, ſemper in eadem voluntate perſeveravit, and to ſpeake briefly, he hath ever ſince perſevered in this minde.* So writ and teſtified the Emperour. In the ſeventh Collation the Emperour ſent *Conſtantine* the moſt glorious Quæſtor of his Palace, unto the Synod, to deliver unto them certaine letters of *Vigilius*, who againe teſtified this from the Emperour before the whole Councell: *Vigilius*, ſaith he [c], *hath very often manifeſted by writings his minde, that he condemneth the Three Chapters, which alſo without writing, he hath ſaid before the Emperour in the preſence of the moſt glorious Iudges, and of very many of your ſelves, who are here in the Councell: et non intermiſit, ſemper anathematizans Theodorum, and hee hath not intermitted or ever ceaſed* (ſince his firſt comming almoſt to *Conſtantinople*) *to anathematize the defenders of Theodorus of Mopſveſtia, and the Epiſtle of Ibas, and the writings of Theodoret againſt Cyrill:* and then delivering the letters of *Vigilius* unto them, he addeth, *Vigilius* doth by theſe make manifeſt, *quod per totum tempus, eorundem trium Capitulorũ impietatem averſatur, that for this whole time* (ſince his firſt conſenting to the

[c] *Iuſtin. Epiſt. ad 5. Synod. Coll. 1. pa. 520. a.*

[c] *Coll. 7. Conc. 5. pa. 578. a.*

the Edict upon his comming to *Constantinople*, untill the assembling of the generall Councell) *hee hath detested the impiety of those Three Chapters*. Thus said and testified *Constantine* from the Emperor.

8. If I should say no more at all, even this one testimony being so pregnant, and withall so certaine, that there can bee no doubt but the Emperor both knew and testified the truth herein, this alone, I say, is sufficient to demonstrate the vanity of that fictitious Synod & decree of *Taciturnity*. For seeing it is hence certaine, that *Vigilius* persisted and persevered to condemne the *Three Chapters*, after the time of his consenting to the Emperors Edict, upon his comming to *Constantinople*, till the time of the fift Councell; it must needs be acknowledged for certaine, that in that time hee made no decree to forbid men to condemne the same; and then, not this decree of Taciturnity, which tyes all mens tongues that they shal neither defend, nor yet condemne them. And if the decree be fictitious, such as was never made, as by this testimony it is now certaine: then is the Councell fictitious wherein it was decreed, then the whole fable of *Baronius*, how the Emperor and *Mennas* violated that decree, how the Pope indured persecution for maintaining that Decree, and the other Consequents, they all are certainly fictitious, this one testimonie overthroweth thē all. But I will adde a second reason drawne from the consideration of the observing and putting in execution this Synodall and pontificall Decree. For it is not to bee doubted, but if such a Decree had beene made, especially, with the consent of a Synod, and of the Emperour also, but some one or other would have observed the same; the rather, because *Baronius* [d] tels us, that upon the publishing of this Decree in the one and twentieth yeare of *Iustinian*, *res consopita siluit*; the controversie was for a while husht. Let us then see who those were whom this Decree made silent or tongue-tyed in this cause, and it will appeare that none at all observed it.

9. Let us begin with the Pope himselfe, who of all is most likely to have kept his owne decree; but he was so farre from observing it, that he practised the quite contrary. In the two and twentieth yeare of *Iustinian*, the very next unto that wherein this decree is supposed to be made, *Rusticus* and *Sebastianus* two Romane Deacons remaning then at *Constantinople*, and being earnest defenders of the *Three Chapters*, writ letters unto divers Bishops, and into divers Provinces against [e] Pope *Vigilius*, and the cause was, for that he condemned [f] the *Three Chapters*, and thereby as they pretended, condemned also the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and for a proofe of their accusation they dispersed [g] the copies of *Vigilius* his Constitution sent unto *Mennas* against the *Three Chapters*. A cleare proofe that as then *Vigilius* neither had made this Decree, nor revoked his judgement for condemning of those Chapters. In the 23. [h] yeare, *Vigilius* writ to *Valentinianus*, to purge himselfe of those slanders [i] and untruths, and that hee doth by referring himselfe to his judgement [k], sent to *Mennas* against the 3. *Chapters*, wherein he then plainly professeth, that what he had therein defined was consonant [l] to the faith of the 4. former Councels, and to the decrees of his predecessors, & he is so resolute in maintaining the same

d Bar. an. 547. nu. 41.

e Hi adversus Rom. Pontificē in diversas provincias literas dedere, Bar. an. 548. nu. 2. is est juxta. Bar. an. Iustin. 22.

f Schismatici scriptis ubiq; vulgaverant, Vigilium tria damnando Capitula impugnare Chalcedonense Concilium. Bar. an 550. nu. 1.

g Exemplaria (Iudicati nostri) per plurimos sacerdotes et laicos in Africana Provincia destinares ait Vig. Rustico et Sebastiano, in sua Epist. ad eos in Conc. 5. Coll. 7 pa. 578. b.

h Epistola Vigilij ad Valentin. data est 15. Kal. April. anno 23. Iustiniani. extat in Conc. 5. Coll. 7. pa. 580. et seq.

i Etiam hoc mentiti sunt, etc. Epist. Vig. ib. pa. 581. a.

k Legant quæ de causa quæ hic mota est ad fratrem nostrum Mennam scribentes legimus definivisse, ibid.

l Ibid.

ſame judgement that he addeth of it, that it is abundant [m] to ſatiſfie any man. An infallible evidence that as yet, nor till that year he had neither revoked his former ſentence, nor made any decree of ſilence to forbid men to condemne the ſame Chapters. In the foure and twentieth [n] yeare hee writ the like Apology to *Aurelianus* Biſhop of *Arles*, yea which is more, *Baronius* [o] ſheweth that in that 24. yeare, he publiſhed his judiciall ſentence of condemnation and depoſition againſt [p] *Ruſticus*, *Sebaſtianus*, *Gerontius*, [q] *Severus*, *Importunus*, *Iohn*, and *Deuſdedit*; for that they [r] by defending the *Three Chapters*, and communicating with ſuch as defended them, *contra Iudicati noſtri ſeriem nitebantur, dealt againſt the tenor of his judgement:* ſhewing plainly that till then, and in that yeare his judgement againſt the *Three Chapters* ſtood ſo firmly in force, that by a judiciall ſentence he depoſed the contradictors thereof, which had himſelfe revoked, and by a Decree of ſilence adnulled; in likelihood he wold not, certainly in juſtice he could not have done; and ſeeing hee cenſured them not for ſpeaking of that controverſie, but for ſpeaking in defence of thoſe Chapters: it is evident, that as then he had not made any Decree for ſilence in that cauſe, for then his cenſure ſhould have beene, becauſe they had done contrary to it, not becauſe they had contradicted his judgement in condemning thoſe Chapters.

10. Is not *Baronius* thinke you a very wiſe and worthy Annaliſt, who perſwades you that *Vigilius* made this Decree of ſilence in the 21. yeare of *Iuſtinian*, forbidding all thereby to condemne the *Three Chapters*, which not to have been made either in the 22, or 23, or 24. yeares, the undoubted writing and cenſures of *Vigilius* expreſſed by *Baronius* himſelfe doe make evident, and teſtifie that the Pope himſelfe was ſo far from being ſilent therein, that both by words, by writings, by pontificall cenſures and judgements, himſelfe condemned the 3, *Chapters*? who will again perſwade you that the Pope ſuffered very heavy perſecution at the Emperors hands, becauſe he would not permit the 3. *Chapters* to be condemned, whereas the Pope himſelfe, not onely condemned them all that time, as well as the Emperor did, but both by writings reproved, and by judiciall cenſures puniſhed, condemned, and depoſed ſuch as would not condemne them, and that alſo *eo nomine*, becauſe they would not condemne them, nor conſent to his judgement whereby he had condemned them. Now that *Vigilius* continued of the ſame mind, both in the 25. & 26. yeares of *Iuſtinian*, that is, untill the time that the fift Councell was aſſembled, though there be no particulars to explaine, yet by the Emperours words before remembred, that *per totum tempus perſeveravit*, and *ejuſdem ſemper voluntatis fuit*, it is abundantly teſtified. So that it is moſt certain, that *Vigilius* at no time obſerved this decree of Taciturnity: and becauſe had there beene any, he of all men was the moſt likely to obſerve it, who as *Baronius* fableth, was ſo rigorous againſt others, even the Emperor alſo, for not obſerving thereof, his not obſerving of it, is an evidence that he made no ſuch Decree at all, but that the whole narration concerning it, and the conſequents upon it, is a very fiction and fable.

11. Next

[m] *Credimus enim, Catholicæ eccleſiæ filys, ea quæ tunc ad Mænam ſcripſimus de blaſphemyis Theodori, ejuſq; perſona, deq; Epiſtola Ibæ, & ſcriptis Theodoreti cõtra rectam fidem, abunde poſſe ſufficere, ibid.*

[n] *Epiſtola Vigilij ad Aurel. data eſt Kal. Maijs an. 24. Iuſtiniani Auguſti, extat in Conc. 5. Coll. 7. pa. 581. b.*

[o] *Iſta hoc anno Conſtantinopoli à Vigilio adverſus ſchiſmaticos decreta fuerunt. Bar. an. 550. (qui eſt Iuſtinians 24.) nu. 36.*

[p] *Ea extat in Conc. 5. Coll. 7. pa. 578. & ſeq. & eam recitat. Bar. an. 550. nu. 16. & ſeq.*

[q] *Hi in ſententia papæ & decreto nominantur, apud Bar. an. eodem, nu. 34.*

[r] *Immutatum te comperimus, & cum adverſarijs eccleſiæ qui contra Iudicati noſtri ſeriem nitebantur ſe, cauſæ tractare, &c. Vigil. in ſuo decreto contra Ruſt. & Sebaſt. apud Bar. an. 550. nu. 21.*

11. Next after the Pope let us see if the Emperor (who as *Baronius* saith [f], promised to observe this law, of *Taciturnity*) was silent & quiet in this cause. And truly there is a strong presumption that he neither did nor would now refuse or forbeare to condemne the 3. *Chapters*, seeing by so doing, he should have anathematized himselfe: for by his Imperiall Edict, he denoūced all those to be an *Anathema*, who do not condemne and [t] anathematize the same Chapters. The very silence in this cause, and ceasing or refusing to anathematize the Chapters, had made him guilty of his owne just *Anathema*. But to leave presumptions, Certaine it is that *Iustinian* continued the same man, constant in condemning those Chapters, and that not onely for the time after this supposed Decree, but from the first publishing of his own Edict, whereof the whole fift Councell is a most ample witnesse, who thus say [u], *omnia semper fecit, & facit, quæ sanctam Ecclesiam & recta dogmata conservant, The most pious Emperor hath ever done* (concerning this cause of the *three Chapters*,) *and now doth those things which preserve the holy Church, and sound doctrine*, and that to be the condemning of these Chapters, they by their Synodall sentence doe make evident, where they professe the *condemning thereof to bee the preserving of the good seed* [x] *of faith, the preserving of the Councell of Chalcedon, and the rooting out of hereticall tares.*

12. And if wee desire particulars of his constant dealing herein, *Victor Tunavensis* declareth the earnestnesse of *Iustinian*, in condemning these Chapters for every yeare since this Decree of Taciturnity is supposed to have beene made. The Decree, as [y] *Baronius* sheweth, was set out in the sixt yeare after the Consulship of *Basilius* (which account by Consular yeares *Victor* useth) and it answereth to the end of twenty one, and most of the 22. yeare of *Iustinian*. In the seaventh yeare after *Basilius* [z] Coss. that is, in the very next to that wherein the Decree was made, *Iustinian* writ most earnestly saith *Victor* [a] into divers provinces, *& antistites cunctos præfata tria Capitula damnare compellit, and hee compelled all Bishops to condemne the Three Chapters*. In the eight he sheweth that the Illyrian Bishops held a Synod, and writ unto the Emperour to disswade him from condemning those Chapters. In the ninth he shewes that *Facundus* did the like, and further in this yeare [b] the Emperor commanded the Synod at *Mopsvestia* to be held against *Theodorus*, that it might appeare how, and from how long time before then, the name of *Theodorus* had beene blotted out of the Ecclesiasticall tables, the judgement of which Synod the Emperor sent [c] to *Vigilius* to assure him of the truth thereof, that hee might with more constancie continue to cōdemne the *Three Chapters*. In the tenth *Victor* declares that the Emperor sent for *Reparatus* and *Firmus* two Primates, for *Primasius*, & *Verecundus*, two Bishops to deale with them, that they would condemne the same Chapters, and that *Zoilus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, for refusing to condemne them was deposed, which to have beene done by the Emperors command, [d] *Liberatus* sheweth. In the eleventh, which was the next before the generall Councell, *Victor* tells us, both that *Firmus* Primate of *Numidia* being wonne [e] by the Emperors gifts (so hee partially writeth) consented

[f] *Bar. an. 551. nu. 2. emissa ſpōſionē de ſervando ſilentio, &c.*

[t] *Si quis nō anathematizat Theodorū et Theodoreti ſcripta, &c. & Epiſtolā Ibæ, Anathema ſit. Edict. Iuſtin.*

[u] *Conc. 5. Coll. 7. in fine.*

[x] *Feſtinantes bonā fidei ſemē purum conſervare ab impietatis Zizaniis. Conc. 5. Coll. 8. pa. 584. a.*

[y] *Bar. an. 547. nu. 1. & 41.*

[z] *Victo. Tun. in Chron. ſed vitio Typogr. ſcribitur an. 8. pro 7. nam proxime præcedens annus apud eū recte numeratur an. 6. poſt Coſſ. Baſ. neque ullum annum omittit ab eo certum eſt.*

[a] *Vict. loc. citat.*

[b] *Nā ſacra Imperatoris ad Iohā. data eſt an. Iuſt. 24. poſt Cōſ. Baſ. a. 9. ext. in Cōc. 5 Col. 6. pa. 553. a.*

[c] *Facta eſt ſuggeſtio ad ſanct. papam Vigiliū ab eiſdem epiſcopis (Concil. Mopſveſteni.) Conc. 5. Coll. 5 pa. 557. a. Acta in Concilio Mopſveſteno ad Vigilium Iuſtiniani Concilio & opera miſſa fuere ne in futura generali Synodo Theodorum ipſe damnare aliquo modo detrectaret. Bar. anno. 550. nu. 39.*

[d] *Zoilum Imperator depoſuit. Liber. ca. 23.*

[e] *Firmus doniis principis corruptus, damnationi 3. Capitulorum aſſenſū præbuit. Vict. an. 11 (corruptè. ſcribitur 12) poſt. Cōſ. Baſ.*

to condemne the Chapters, but *Primaſius*, *Verecundus*, and *Macarius* for not conſenting, were all baniſhed. So cleare and undoubted it is that the Emperor continued ſo conſtant in his condemning of theſe Chapters, that for every yeare ſince the Decree of Silence is ſuppoſed to be made, he was reſolute in this cauſe, condemning and baniſhing ſuch as conſented not to the condemning of them.

13. Whence the ſhameleſſe untruths of the Baronian narration is demonſtrated. He tells you, and tells it with a *Conſtat*, that in the next yeare before the fift Councell, the Emperour recalled his Edict, and abrogated what he had done in this cauſe of the 3. *Chapters*, whereas not onely the whole generall Councell teſtifieth on the contrary, that hee ſtill perſiſted conſtant in condemning of them, but *Victor* (one who had good reaſon to know theſe matters, as feeling the ſmart of the Emperors ſeverity for his obſtinacie in defending thoſe Chapters) particularly witneſſeth of that very yeare, that the Emperor was ſo eager in maintaining his Edict, and condemning the Chapters, that he both drew *Firmus*, the Primate of *Numidia* to his opiniõ, and baniſhed *Macarius* Patriarch of *Ieruſalem*, *Verecundus* Biſhop of *Nica*, and *Primaſius* another Biſhop, becauſe they would not conſent to his Edict, and condemne the ſame Chapters. And what a brainleſſe deviſe was this, that the Emperor in his 25. yeare ſhould hang out his Edict, at Conſtantinople, ſo the Cardinall [f] fableth, as a matter of ſome great noveltie, to bee publiſhed to the Citie, whereas his Edict foure or five yeares before, was ſo divulged throughout the whole Church, that none may be thought to have beene ignorant thereof, ſeeing *univerſus* [g] *orbis Catholicus*, the whole Catholike Church was divided and rent into a ſchiſme about that Edict, the one halfe defending, the other oppugning the ſame? Or what reaſon can the fabler give, why *Vigilius* ſhould in the 25. yeare quarrell with the Emperor, rather then in the 24. 23. 22. in every one of which, *Iuſtinian* was the ſame man, conſtant in maintaining the truth publiſhed by his Edict? Did the hanging out of the Edict, more provoke the Popes zeale then the baniſhing, impriſoning of thoſe who withſtood the Edict? more then the Emperors enforcing, and compelling, *omnes antiſtites*, all the Biſhops to condemne the *Three Chapters*? But enough of *Iuſtinian*, to manifeſt that he never obſerved this fictitious Decree of Taciturnitie.

[f] *Iuſtinianus Imp. contra tria Capitula publice (Conſtantinopoli) appendi juſſit edictum. Bar. an. 551. (qui eſt 10. poſt Coſſ. Baſil.) nu. 2.*

[g] *Bin. not. in Conc. 5. § Concilium. & Bar. an. 547. nu. 29.*

14. After the Emperor and Pope, let us ſee if Catholikes, that is, thoſe who condemned the three Chapters, did obſerve this Decree. They did not: but like the Emperour, they conſtantly continued to ſpeake, to write againſt them as well after as before the time of this ſuppoſed Decree, it ſtopt not the mouth of any one of them; Not of *Mennas*, not of *Theodorus* [h], whom, [i] for talking ſo much againſt thoſe Chapters *Vigilius* ſuſpended, and excommunicated, as the Baronian narration tells you, not of the other Biſhops, ſubject to thē, for *Vigilius* uſed the very ſame cenſure againſt them alſo, for their condemning of thoſe Chapters, *We*, ſaith [k] *Vigilius*, *condemne thee O Mennas*, with all the Biſhops pertaining to thy Dioceſſe, yea, *we condemne alſo thy fellow Eaſtern Biſhops though of diverſe provinces, be they of greater*

[h] *Bar. an. 551. nu. 5. Theodorus adverſus tria capitula cuncta publice agere non deſtitit.*

[i] *Excommunicatio refertur à Bar. an. 551. nu. 11. 12.*

[k] *Ibid. nu. 12.*

ter or leſſer Cities, wee condemne and excommunicate them all. Neither did they begin to condemne the Chapters, in that 25. yeare, wherein this ſentence, by the accoumpt of *Baronius* was pronounced, but they did this ever ſince the time, that the Decree of Silence is ſuppoſed to bee made; for *Vigilius* there ſaith [l] to *Theodorus*, wee have declared *pene hoc quinquennio elapſo, almoſt theſe five yeares laſt paſt*, our longanimitie and patience both towards you, and towards thoſe who have beene ſeduced by you; which five yeares being reckned backe, will fall out in the 21. yeare of *Iuſtinian*, even from that yeare (and then was the decree of Silence ſaid to bee publiſhed) did the Eaſtern Biſhops continue to ſpeake againſt, and condemne the *three Chapters*. Now although this againſt *Baronius*, who applaudes that ſentence and writing of *Vigilius*, bee ſufficient, yet becauſe it is onely *argumentum ad hominem*, I will adde a more weightie teſtimonie to cleare this matter, concerning Catholikes, & that is, of the whole fift generall Councell, which ſaith [m], the Emperor doth manifeſt *quod nec quenquam latuit, that whereof no man is ignorant*, that the impietie of theſe Chapters, *ab initio aliena eſt à ſancta Dei eccleſia, is ſtrange, and hath beene diſliked by the holy Church, ever ſince the controverſie about them hath beene moved.* Then certainely no Catholike, none Catholikely affected at any time forbore to condemne them, not one of them obſerved that Decree of Silence.

l *Ibid. nu. 7.*

m *Conc. 5. Coll. 7. in fine.*

15. All the Cardinalls hope is now in the Defenders of theſe Chapters; they no doubt would bee willing to obey this Pontificall and Synodall Decree; ſeeing for the moſt part, they were *Africane, Illyrian*, & Weſtern Biſhops. Among them, if any where, the Pope might hope to have his Decree obſerved. They obſerve it? They are ſilent in this cauſe; Nay you ſhall ſee them, after the time that this Decree is ſuppoſed to be made, to be farre more eager in defending the *Three Chapters*, then ever they were before. For now, beſides the defending of thoſe Chapters, they boldly and bitterly invaighed againſt *Vigilius* himſelfe, becauſe he condemned the ſame. This [n] did *Liberatus* at *Carthage*, at *Tunen Victor*, at *Conſtantinople Facundus*, the Popes owne orator, (who now having turnd his ſtile, whetted it as ſharpe againſt the Pope, as before he had done at the Popes command againſt the Emperor) yea the Popes owne Romane Deacons, *Ruſticus* and *Sebaſtianus*, beſides others, freely, and openly declamed [o] againſt the Pope, as one, who by condemning the 3. *Chapters*, did condemne the Councell of *Chalcedon*: nay, they proceeded even to flout and taint the Pope, for his condemning of thoſe Chapters, deriding his ſentence againſt *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia* being dead, in this manner [p], the Pope ſhould have condemned not onely the perſon, and writings of *Theodorus, ſed & territorium ipſum ubi poſitus eſt, but even the very ground alſo where hee was buried*, adding, that if any could finde but the bones of *Theodorus*, (though now accurſed by the Pope) *gratanter acciperent*, they would very lovingly embrace them and keepe them for holy relickes.

n *Bar. ann. 548. nu. 6. Non tantũ Ruſticus acuit ſtilum contra Vigilium, ſed alij plures, Liberatus, Victor, &c.*

o *Vbique vulgarunt ipſum Vigilium tria damnando capitula impugnare Concilium Chale. Bar. an. 550. nu. 1.*

p *Vigilius in ſua ſententia, ſeu Epiſtola Ruſtico et Sebaſtiano in Conc. 5. Coll. 7. pa. 378. b.*

16. And what ſpeake I of a few particular men? In the 23. yeare of *Iuſtinian*, that is, in the ſecond yeare after the ſuppoſed Decree, the Illyrian

Illyrian[y] Bishops held a Synod, by which was both writ a booke in defence of those Chapters, and sent unto the Emperor, and *Benenatus* Bishop of *Iustineanea*, was condemned by the same Synod, because hee spake against those Chapters. The next yeare[z] after that, did the Africane Bishops hold a Synod, wherein they did *nominatim*, and expresly condemne Pope *Vigilius*, excommunicate him, and shut him out of their communion, because he was one of those who condemned the *Three Chapters*, as *Victor* Bishop of *Tunea*, who as it seemes was present in that Synod, doth testifie. Now seeing the Cardinall professeth[a] that these divisions, and contentions were among Catholikes, *pugnantibus inter se orthodoxis, orthodoxall Bishops and Catholikes they were, who at this time fought one against another*, yea and by his position, Schismaticall they were not, because[b] the Pope had not yet given his last sentence. If one listed to digresse, here were a fit occasion to make a little sport with his Cardinalship, upon whose assertion it clearely ensueth, that a Synod, even an Africane Synod (which with them is more) yea the whole Church of Africke, may (and *de facto* hath so done) judge, censure, excommunicate and exclude from their communion the Pope; and yet for all this, themselves at the same time may be, and have *de facto* beene very good Catholikes, and neither heretickes, nor schismatickes. But of that point I have before intreated. This onely I doe now observe, that by the view and consideration of all sorts, and degrees of men in the Church, none at all observed that decree of Silence in this cause, not the Pope, not the Emperor, not the Orthodoxall professors, & such as before condemned the Chapters, not the hereticall defenders of them: All these (and in one of these rankes, were comprehended all Christians at that time) by their speeches, by their writings, by their actions, by their Synodall decrees and judgements, doe evidently witnesse that there was no such decree of Silence ever made, which without all question amongst some one order and degree or other, would have been observed, and taken effect.

17. To these I will adde one other reason, taken from the weaknesse, and unsoundnesse of that ground whereon the Cardinall hath framed this whole narration. He tells[c] us that this Decree of Silence, the Synod wherein it was made, and divers of the consequents (for some are of the Cardinalls owne invention) are testified by certaine publike acts or Records, to wit, those which contained the sentence and Pontificall *Constitution*[d] of Pope *Vigilius* against *Mennas*, *Theodorus*, and the rest. In those acts indeed a good part of this Baronian fable is related, how *Mennas*, *Dacius*, and many other both Greeke and Latine Bishops were present in this Synod, at the making of this Decree: how *Theodorus*,[e] and other Eastern Bishops had dealt for the space of five yeares against that Decree: how the Pope[f] after five yeares toleration and longanimitie, called an other Synod, and therin pronounced a sentence of Excommunication against *Theodorus*, *Mennas*, and the rest, till they should acknowledge their fault, and make a satisfaction for the same. These and some other particulars are there expressed. Now if we can demonstrate these publike Acts

y *Vict. Tun. an. 8. post Conf. Bas. sed corrupte legitur 9.*
z *Vict. Tun. an. 9 post Conf. Basil.*
a *Bar. an. 548. nu. 6.*
b *Qui postea (post ultimum judicium Papæ) ab his dissensere, Schismatici habiti sunt. Cum tamen interea ante novissimum Apostolicæ sedis assensum, non esset piaculum pro tribus pugnare capitulis. Bar. an. 546. nn. 38.*
c *De hoc Vigilij decreto (pro Silentio) et inita cũ Theodoro & Menna transactione, testes sunt acta publica. Bar. an. 547. nu. 42. Ista Acta vocat, Constitutum Vigilij de Anathemate. an. 551. nu. 12.*
d *Extat tum apud Bar. an. 551 nu. 6. et seq. tum apud Bin. post. Epist. 16. Vigilij.*
e *Ibid. nu. 3. pene hoc quinquennio.*
f *Ib. nu. 11. et 12.*

of *Baronius* to bee no other than forgeries, I thinke none will make doubt, but that all the reſt of the Baronian narration which relyes hereon, is a very fiction.

18. But can thoſe publike Acts be convinced for ſuch? they may; and that moſt evidently, beſides many other meanes, by comparing the date of this ſentence againſt *Mennas*, with the time of the death of *Mennas*. Theſe Acts, Records, Sentence, or Conſtitution againſt *Mennas* (call them what you liſt) were made in the 25 yeare of *Iuſtinian*, for ſo in the date [g] of them is expreſſed; nor can it bee ſuppoſed that there is any error either in the writer or Printer, for both the Conſular yeare is alſo added [h], to wit, the tenth after the Coſſ. of *Baſilius*, which anſwereth to the 25 of *Iuſtinian*, and the Pope accounts there almoſt five [i] yeares, ſince the Decree of Silence was made; which being placed by *Baronius* [k] in the 21, the fift current yeare after it, will directly fal to be the 25 year. So in the 25 of *Iuſtinian* did the Pope excõmunicate *Mennas*; yea, write and ſend this Excommunication unto him, ſaying unto him in this [l] manner, *Teq; Mennam tamdiu à ſacra communione ſuſpendimus; we ſuſpend thee O Mennas*, and all the other Biſhops in thy Dioceſſe, ſo long untill every one of you acknowledging his errour ſhall make competent ſatisfaction for his owne fault, which ſatisfaction, and ſubmiſſion to have beene performed by *Mennas* in the next yeare, to wit, the 26 of *Iuſtinian*, *Baronius* [m] with great pompe declareth. Now *Mennas* dyed five yeares before he offered this booke of ſupplication, or ſubmitted himſelfe to *Vigilius*; & 4. before the Pope ſent out this Excommunication unto him, with that admonition to ſubmit himſelfe; for it is certainly teſtified by the Popes Legates in the ſixt generall Councell, that *Mennas* dyed in the 21 yeare of *Iuſtinian*. In that Councell [n] a ſermon or ſpeech going under the name of *Mennas*, to *Vigilius*, was produced as a part of the Acts of the fift Councell, the Legates of Pope *Agatho* cryed out before the Emperor and the whole Councell, that it was a forgery: which they proved [o], and that moſt manifeſtly, becauſe *Mennas* dyed in the 21 yeare of *Iuſtinian*, but the fift Synod was congregated in the 26 yeare, which ended on the firſt of *April*, though the firſt Seſſion of the Synod was not held till the *May* next after, which was in the 27 yeare of *Iuſtinian*. Thus teſtified the Popes owne Legates; and the Emperour, with the whole Synod, upon their evidence, rejected their writing for a forgerie.

g *Data 19. Kal. Septemb. Imperante Domino Iuſtiniano an. 25. poſt. Conſ. Baſily anno decimo. Bar. an. 558 nu. 12.*

h *Ibid.*

i *Pene hoc quinquennio elapſo monſtravimus. Ibid. nu. 7.*

k *Bar. an. 547. (qui eſt Iuſtiniani. 21.) nu. 41. et 43.*

l *Apud Bar. an. 551. nu. 12.*

m *Bar. an. 552. nu. 20. Poſt Mennas libellum ſupplicem Vigilio obtulit.*

n *Conc. 6. Act. 3.*

o *Eo argumento manifeſtiſſimè comprobarunt, quod Mennas ſex annis ante quintam Synodum ſub Vigilio celebratam ex hac vitâ migraſſet. Bin. not. in Conc. 6. in Act. 3.*

19. Said I not truly unto you, that the Baronian narration was a peece of rare Poetry? might not a meane Poet make an excellent Tragedy of it? were it not a fine Pageant, to ſee the Pope, and ſo many Biſhops ſit in *Vtopia*, and there make a law for *Taciturnity*, the Emperour, the Senate, and people conſenting unto it? would it not bee another, and farre more delightfull Act, to ſee the Pope and Emperour quarrelling about this law; the one beating, buffeting, and perſecuting; the other fleeing both by Sea and land, from *Placidiana* to Saint *Peter*, from him to *Euphemia*, from *Conſtantinople* to *Chalcedon*? what a ſport were it to ſee the Romane *Apollo* aſcend into his Delphian throne, and thence, as from *Olympus*, caſt his fierie darts, his thun-

ders

ders and lightnings againſt that *Typhoëan* generation, which durſt ſpeake when he enjoyned ſilence? Now the embaſſage which the Emperour ſent to *Chalcedon* to intreat his Holineſſe to returne, the magnanimity of the Pope in refuſing to come from the Altar, the Emperours yeelding to all that he preſcribed; this of it ſelfe would incourage a Poet, and cauſe him to preſume of an applauſe: But the moſt rare Pageant of all would bee, to ſee and heare *Mennas*, foure yeares after he was dead and rotten, to ſpeake and diſpute againſt the Decree of Silence (the *Silentes umbræ*, to declame againſt Silence) to ſee him a Biſhop, a Patriarch, at the voyce of the Popes ſentence; *Audiſne hæc Amphiarai ſub terram abditæ*; to come *ab inferis*, to come with a Bill of ſupplication in his hand, with a ſong of *Miſerere* in his mouth, to the Romane *Iove*, and intreat pardon for his talking ſo much in the grave, and among the infernall ghoſts, againſt the Popes Decree of Silence; & after all this to ſee the Pope ſhake hands with him, and all his Metropolitanes, and Micropolitanes [p], (note the eloquence of the Pope), and ſo, after a moſt joyfull reconcilement, to ſee the holy Reliques caried in a golden Chariot (an excellent dumbe ſhew) about the City, and that by a dead man; Can you doe leſſe than give the Poet *Baronius* a Plaudite for his ſo rare invention, or contriving of this Fable?

[p] *Tu cum omnibus Metropolitanis et Micropolitanis Epiſcopis. Vigil. ſententia apud Bar. an. 551. nu. 12.*

20. Why, but is it credible that Cardinall *Baronius*, the great Annaliſt of our age, hee who beſtowed thirty [q] yeares in the ſtudy of theſe Eccleſiaſticall affaires, that hee ſhould ſo foully be overſeene in a computation ſo eaſie, and ſo obvious, as to thinke *Mennas* to bee excommunicated, to come with a ſupplication to the Pope, and to ride in a triumphant Chariot, with thoſe holy reliques, foure or five yeares after he was dead and rotten? Overſeene? nothing leſſe: It was no ignorance, no overſight in him; he knew all this matter *ad unguem*, hee knew that *Mennas* was dead long before that ſubmiſſion, and triumph: But the Cardinall was diſpoſed, either to recreate the reader with the contemplation of this his Poetical fiction, or elſe for to ſhew you, that, with the charme of thoſe forgeries, and counterfeit writings, with which he hath ſtuffed his Annals, hee is able to metamorphoze all other men into very blocks and beetles, that they ſhall applaud his moſt abſurd dotages as undoubted and hiſtoricall truths; which, that every man may perceive, it muſt be obſerved, that though in this place, where the cauſe betwixt *Vigilius* and the Emperor, is debated, the Cardinall is content that you ſhould thinke *Mennas* to have been alive in the 26. [r] year of *Iuſtinian*, that is, five years after he was dead, for otherwiſe all his narration, even the whole play had been ſpoiled, there had neither beene any Decree of Silence, nor any perſecution by *Iuſtinian*, nor any flight of *Vigilius*, nor any excommunication of *Mennas* or *Theodorus*, nor any ſubmiſſion of them, and of the Emperour alſo to the Pope, the Pope had not beene knowne to bee ſo farre above Biſhops, Patriarks, and Emperours, that they muſt all ſtoope to him, and, laying their necks at his feet, ſay unto him, *Calcate me ſalem inſipidum*, puniſh me as you pleaſe for ſpeaking without your Holineſſe leave and licence, yea, that Kings muſt pull downe, abrogate, and

[q] *Hoc opus ante annos circiter 30 aggreſſus ſum. Bar. in præfat. dedic. ante tom. 1. Annalium.*

[r] *Hoc anno (26. Iuſtiniani) finem vivendi fecit Mennas. Bar. an. 552. nu. 21.*

and adnull their imperiall Edicts, if the Pope doe but becke unto them; though, for theſe conſiderations, hee is here willing that you beleeve that untruth concerning *Mennas*, for all theſe depend on that one ſentence of *Anathema* againſt *Mennas*; yet, when this matter is over-paſt, when the Cardinall comes to a new argument, where hee hopes, this, which is ſaid about the cauſe of *Vigilius*, wil be forgotten, there he confeſſeth the truth indeed concerning *Mennas*, and tels you a quite contrary tale: For intreating of the Acts of the ſixt Councel, & particularly of that reaſon of the Popes Legates againſt the forged Epiſtle in *Mennas* name, he thus [f] ſaith, *Ejuſque rei certum illud attulerunt argumentum, quod Mennas diem obiit anno 21 Iuſtiniani Imperatoris: The Legates give a certaine proofe, that the writing was forged, becauſe Mennas dyed in the 21 yeare of Iuſtinian the Emperour.* Loe, the Cardinall knew, and profeſſeth it to bee, not onely true, but certaine, that *Mennas* dyed in the 21 yeare of *Iuſtinian*, and yet againſt his owne certain knowledge, for maintaining this fictitious Decree of Silence, and the fables thereon depending, he perſwades you to beleeve that *Mennas* dealt againſt this Decree, was excommunicated by *Vigilius*, and ſubmitted himſelfe to the Pope, and rode with the relikes five yeares after he was dead.

[f] Bar. an. 680. nu. 46.

21. Truly this was ſcarſe faire and honeſt dealing in the Cardinall, by untruths to ſtrive to bolſter out forged Acts and writing: But the Cardinals Annals are ſo full of ſuch like ſtuffe, that, if you divide them into foure parts, I doe conſtantly affirme there is no more truth in three of thoſe foure, than you have ſeene to bee in this fable, which from a moſt baſe forgery, knowne alſo to the Cardinall for ſuch, hee hath commended for a grave and authentike hiſtory unto us: And I ſhould grow ſomewhat out of patience to ſee the Cardinall ſo groſly contradict, both the truth, and his owne writings alſo; but that, by my long and ſerious toſſing of his bookes, I perceive this is ſo familiar a tricke with him, that, for the uſuall meeting of it, I have long ſince forgotten to be angry with him for ſuch pettie faults. This I hope, which hath beene declared, will ſerve for a caveat unto all, to take heed how they credit any matter whatſoever upon the Cardinals relation: either it is in it ſelfe untrue, or it ſprings from ſome untruth, or by his purpoſe in relating it, it is made to ſerve but for a pully to draw you into ſome untruth, *aut aliquis latet dolus, either in the head or taile there is a ſting*, beleeve him not. And I would alſo have added ſomewhat for *Binius*, who in this [t], as in other fancies and fables, applauds *Baronius*; but I ſuppoſe, that as hee ſucketh his errours from *Baronius*, ſo hee will thinke, that the refuting of *Baronius* is a ſufficient warning for him to purge his Edition of the Councels from ſuch vile and ſhameleſſe untruths. Thus much of that former point which concernes the ſecond Period in *Vigilius* changings.

[t] *Bin. Not. in Vigilij ſententiam contra Theodorum, tom. 2. Conc. pa. 504.*

[CAP.

CAP. XVII.

That Vigilius, *neither by his Pontificall* Decree, *nor ſo much as by a* perſonall profeſſion *conſented to, or confirmed the fift Councell, after the end thereof, or after his ſuppoſed exile.*

1. THE other point propoſed concernes that fourth and laſt change of *Vigilius* judgement, whereby, as *Baronius* [a] tels us, he, by his *Apoſtolicall Decree* [b] confirmed the fift Councell, when, about a yeare [c] after the end thereof, he returned out of exile. That ſuch a change of *Vigilius* can no way helpe *Baronius*, or his cauſe, though it ſhould be granted unto him, we have before [d] declared; but becauſe al which we then ſaid was onely ſpoken upon a ſuppoſall and admiſſion of this Baronian change, we will now more nearly examine the whole matter, and try whether there was indeed any ſuch Decree ever made by *Vigilius*, and whether he did at any time after the end of the fift Councell change his judgement, in ſuch ſort, that he became a condemner of the *Three Chapters*, and an approver of the fift Synod. And truly I could wiſh ſo much good to *Vigilius*, as that there might appeare ſome cleare, and ancient records, to teſtifie his renouncing of hereſie, and condemning of his owne hereticall and *Cathedrall decree*, publiſhed in the time of the Councell, for defence of the *Three Chapters*: But the truth is more precious unto me than the love of *Vigilius* or any Pope whatſoever; & becauſe it is the truth alone which cauſeth me to diſcuſſe this point, I muſt needs confeſſe, that I can finde nothing at all, which can effectually induce mee to beleeve it, but there are many and pregnant reaſons which inforce me to thinke, that *Vigilius* never made any ſuch *Decree* or Change, as *Baronius* fancieth, but that this whole fourth Period and change of *Vigilius*, ſo gloriouſly painted out by *Baronius*, is nothing elſe but another fiction, and peece of the Cardinals owne Poetry, which, without all warrant or ground from any ancient writer, hee, like a Spider, onely out of his owne braine hath woven and deviſed.

2. That *Vigilius* made no ſuch *Decree*, the reaſon wch *Bar.* gives in this very caſe, may declare: he, to prove that *Vigilius* made not this decree, either during the time of the Synod, or ſhortly after the end thereof, hath theſe words [e], If *Vigilius* had then aſſented by his letters, *utique literæ illæ Actis fuiſſent intextæ; verily thoſe letters, purchaſed with ſo great labour, would have beene inſerted among the Acts of the fift Synod, and a great number of copies would have been taken thereof, ſpred abroad, and made knowne to all Churches, as well in the Eaſt, as Weſt, (even as the Epiſtle of* Leo *was) becauſe by thoſe letters, validarentur quæ à Synodo ſancita; thoſe things which the fift Synod had decreed, the Pope contradicting them, and thereby they being invalid, ſhould now be made of force, the Pope conſenting to them.* Thus *Baronius*. Doth not the ſame reaſon as effectually prove, that

[a] *Cum vero Vigilius graviori damno univerſum Orientem ab Eccleſia Rom. diviſum cerneret, niſi Synodo quintæ conſentiret, eam probavit. Bar. an. 553 nu. 235.*

[b] *Vigilius abrogato quod pro 3. Capitulis ediderat Conſtituto, quintæ Synodo adverſanti, eandem Synodum authoritate Apoſtolica comprobavit. Bar. 554. nu. 7. Vigilius hanc Synodum quintam, ſuo Decreto, ſuaque authoritate Pontificia confirmavit. Bin. not. in Conc. 5. § Præſtitit; et Decretū Vigilij vocat Bar. an. 553. nu. 231.*

[c] *Quo anno (554.) Vigilius præcibus Narſetis liberetur exilio. Bar. an. 554. nu. 1. neceſſe eſt dicere id à Vigilio factum (id eſt quintam Synodum comprobatam) hoc tempore (an. 554.) cum ab exilio ſolutus eſt. Bar. ibid. nu. 4. Idem ait Bin. not. in Conc. 5. § Præſtitit.*

[d] *Sup. ca. 15.*

[e] *Bar. an. 553. nu. 223.*

that he made no ſuch decree at al, or not a yeare after, as that he made it not within one or two moneths after the end of the Synod? with what labour, at what price would not the Biſhops of the fift Synod have purchaſed that decree? how gladly would they have annexed it to their Acts, as the Decree of *Leo* is to the acts at *Chalcedon*? How many copies and extracts would they have taken of it, and diſperſed them every where, both in the Weſt and Eaſt, to teſtifie the truth of their Synodall judgement, and that the *infallible* Iudge had conſented to their ſentence, and confirmed the ſame. Or would they have done this within a month, and not a yeare after the end of the Synod? what odds to the point in hand can that ſmall difference of time make in the cauſe? ſpecially conſidering that the very Epiſtle of *Leo* [f], whereof the Cardinall ſpeaketh, was not written till five [g] moneths after the end of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, and yet was it annexed to the acts thereof. If then the Cardinalls reaſon bee of force to prove that hee writ not this Decree ſhortly after the Synod, it is altogether as effectuall to prove he writ it not at all, nor after his returne about a year after out of exile.

f *Ea eſt Epiſt. Leonis 61. quæ incipit, Omnem fraternitatem.*

g *Conc. Chalc. deſijt 28. Oct. Coſſ. Martiano. aut 1. Novemb. ut patet ex ult. Seſſ. Epiſtola vero Leonis ſcripta eſt 21. Martij Coſſ. Opilione, ut patet ex fine Epiſt.*

8. The Cardinall gives yet another evidence hereof, *Pelagius*, ſaith he [h], *the ſucceſſor of* Vigilius *did thinke it fit, that the fift Synod ſhould bee approved, and the three Chapters condemned, moved eſpecially hereunto by this reaſon, that the Eaſterne Church, ob Vigilij conſtitutum ſchiſmate ſciſſa, being rent and divided from the Romane by reaſon of the Conſtitution of* Vigilius, *might be united unto it.* How was the Eaſterne Church divided from the Romane in the time of *Pelagius*, by reaſon of that decree of *Vigilius* in defence of the *Three Chapters*, if *Vigilius* by another decree publiſhed after it had recalled, and adnulled it? If the Popes condemning of thoſe Chapters, and approving of the fift Councell could unite the Churches, then the decree of *Vigilius* (had there beene any ſuch) would have effected that union. If the *Apoſtolike Decree* of *Vigilius* could not effect it, in vaine it was for *Pelagius* to thinke by his approbation, which could have no more authority then *Apoſtolicall*, to effect that union. If the cauſe of the breach and diſunion of thoſe Churches was, as *Baronius* truly ſaith, the *Conſtitution* of *Vigilius* in defence of the *Three Chapters*, againſt the judgement of the fift Synod, ſeeing it is cleare by the Cardinalls owne confeſſion, that the diſunion continued till after the death of *Vigilius*, it certainly hence followeth, that the *Conſtitution* of *Vigilius*, which was the cauſe of that breach, was never by himſelfe repealed, which even in *Pelagius* time remained in force, and was then a wall of ſeparation of the Eaſterne, from the Weſterne Church. Againe, if the Popes approving the fift Councell, and condemning the *three Chapters* was, as in truth it was, and as the Cardinall noteth [i] it to have beene, the cauſe to unite thoſe Churches, ſeeing by his owne confeſſion in *Vigilius* time they were not united (for *Pelagius* [k] after *Vigilius* his death) fought to take away that ſchiſme) it certainly hence followeth, that *Vigilius* never by any *Decree* approved that Synod, and their Synodall condemning of thoſe Chapters: for had he ſo done, the union had in his time preſently beene effected.

h *Bar. an. 553. nu. 236.*

i *Cujus (Vigilij) poſtremam ſententiam (pro approbatione 5. Conc. & condemnatione trium Capitulorum) poſteri omnes ſequuti, univerſa Dei Eccleſia paucis ſchiſmaticis exceptis, eandem Synodum ut œcumenicam ſemper novit. Bar. an. 554. nu. 7.*

k *Bar. an. 553. nu. 236.*

4. The ſame may be perceived alſo by the Weſterne Church. For as that *Pontificall decree* of *Vigilius* (had there beene any ſuch) would have united the Eaſterne, ſo much more would it have drawne the Weſterne, the Italian, and ſpecially the Romane Church, to conſent to the fift Councell, and condemning of the *three Chapters*: but that they perſiſted in the defence of the *three Chapters*, and that alſo to the very end of *Vigilius* his life, may divers wayes be made evident. Whē *Pelagius* being then but a Deacon was choſen Pope after the death of *Vigilius*, and was to be conſecrated Biſhop; there could no more then two Biſhops [l] be found in the Weſterne Church that would conſecrate or ordaine him Biſhop: wherefore contrary to that Canon both of the Apoſtles [m] and Nicene Fathers [n], requiring three [o] Biſhops to the conſecration of a Biſhop (which they ſo often boaſt [p] of in their diſputes againſt us) the Pope himſelfe was faine to be ordained onely by two Biſhops, with a Preſbyter of *Oſtia* in ſtead of the third. *Anaſtaſius* very ignorantly, (if not worſe) ſets downe the reaſon thereof to have beene, for that *Pelagius* was ſuſpected [q] to have beene guilty (by poiſon or ſome other way) of the death of *Vigilius*. A very idle fancie, as is the moſt in *Anaſtaſius*; for *Pelagius* was in baniſhment long before the death of *Vigilius*, and there continued till *Vigilius* [r] was dead, he had little leiſure nor opportunity to thinke of poiſoning or murdering his owne Biſhop, by whoſe death he could expect no gaine. The true cauſe why the Weſterne Biſhops diſtaſted *Pelagius*, is noted by *Victor* who then lived. *Hee* [s] *before hee came from Conſtantinople conſented to the fift Synod, and condemned the Three Chapters.* Now the Weſterne [t] Biſhops ſo deteſted the fift Synod, and thoſe who with it condemned thoſe Chapters, that among them all there could be found but two Biſhops who held with the Synod, and ſo allowed of *Pelagius* and his act in conſenting thereunto, and thoſe two with the Presbyter of *Oſtia*, were the ordainers of *Pelagius*, whom *Victor* in his corrupted language calls prevaricators. Let any man now conſider with himſelfe, whether it bee credible that in all *Italy*, and ſome Provinces adjoyning, there ſhould be but two Biſhops who would conſēt to the *Apoſtolicall decree* of *Vigilius*, for approving the fift Councell, if he had indeed publiſhed ſuch a *decree*. If they knew not the Popes ſentence in this cauſe (which they held, and that rightly, for a cauſe of faith) to be *infallible*, how was not the weſterne or the Romane Church hereticall at this time, not knowing that point of faith, which is the tranſcendent principle and foundation of all doctrines of faith? If they knew it to bee *infallible*, ſeeing his judgement muſt then overſway their owne, how could there bee no more but two biſhops found among them all, who approved the Popes Cathedrall ſentence, and conſented to his *infallible* judgement? Seeing then it is certaine that the Weſterne Church did generally reject the fift Synod, after the death of *Vigilius*, and ſeeing it is not to bee thought

l *Dum non eſſent Epiſcopi qui eum ordinarent, inventi ſunt duo, Iohannes, & Bonus, & Andreas Presbyter de Oſtia, & ordinaverunt eum Epiſcopum, Anaſt. in vita Pelagij 1.*

m *Can. Apoſt. 1*

n *Conc. Nic. Can. 4.*

o *Certe omnimodo 3 Epiſcopi debent eſſe congregati,... & ita faciant ordinationem.' Can. 4. Conc. Nic.*

p *Bell. lib. de Notis Eccleſiæ, ca. 8. §. Ex quo. Et Bin. in Notis ad Can. 1. Apoſt. alijq;*

q *Subduxerunt ſe à communione ejus, dicentes, quia in morte Vigilij ſe miſcuit. Anaſt. in vita Pelag. 1.*

r *Nam Vigilius obijt anno præcedente quum Pelagius de exilio revocatus eſt. Vict. Tun. in Chron. ad an. 16. (corrupte legitur 17.) Baſilij, et ad an. ſequentem.*

s *Pelagius condemnans ea (tria Capitula) quæ dudum conſtantiſſime defendebat, à prævaricatoribus ordinatus eſt. Vict. ad an. 17. (corrupte legitur 18.) poſt Conſ. Baſilij.* t *Adeo exhorruiſſe viſi ſunt Antiſtites occidentales ferè omnes, aliam poſt 4. admittere Œcumenicam Synodum, ut non potuerit Pelagius reperire Epiſcopos Romæ, à quibus conſecraretur. Bar. an. 556. nu. 2.*

that

that they would have perſiſted in ſuch a generall diſlike thereof had they knowne *Vigilius* to have by his *Apoſtolicall* ſentence decreed, that all ſhould approve the ſame, of which his ſentence (had there been any ſuch) they could not have beene ignorant (for if by no other meanes, which were very many, *Pelagius* himſelfe would have brought and aſſuredly made knowne the ſame unto them) this their generall rejection of the fift Synod, is an evident proofe that this Baronian decree which hee aſcribeth to *Vigilius* is no better then the former of ſilence, both untrue, both fictitious, and of the two, this the far worſe, ſeeing for this the Cardinall hath not ſo much as any one, no not a forged writing, on which he may ground it, it is wholy deviſed by himſelfe, he the onely Poet or maker of this fable.

5. To this may be added that which is mentioned in [u] *Bede* concerning the Councell of *Aquileia* in *Italy*. That Councell was held neare about, or rather, as by [x] *Sigonius* narration it appeareth, after the death of *Vigilius*; and in it were preſent *Honoratus* Biſhop of *Millan*, *Macedonius* B. of *Aquileia*, *Maximianus* B. of *Ravenna*, beſides many other Biſhops of *Liguria*, *Venice* and *Iſtria*. Theſe being as *Bede* [y] ſaith, unskilfull of the faith, doubted to approve the fift Synod; nay, *Concilium illud* [z] *non obſervandum eſſe ſtatuère, they decreed that the fift Synod ſhould not be allowed or received.* What? would ſo many Italian Biſhops in an Italian Councell decree the quite contradictory to the Popes known judiciall ſentence in a cauſe of faith? the Pope decreed (as *Baronius* ſaith) that the fift Councell ought to be imbraced. The Italian Synod decreeth that the fift Councell ought to be rejected. Neither onely did they thus decree, but as *Bede* [a] noteth, they continued in this opinion, *donec ſalutaribus beati Pelagij* [b] *monitis inſtructa conſenſit, untill being inſtructed by the wholſome admonitions of Pope Pelagius, they conſented to the fift Councell*, as other Churches did. Now this *Pelagius* of whom *Bede* ſpeaketh, was *Pelagius* the ſecond, who was not Pope till more then 20. [c] yeares after the death of *Vigilius*. He to reclame thoſe Biſhops of *Iſtria*, *Venice*, and *Liguria*, writ a very large and decretall Epiſtle [d] (which *Binius* [e] compares to that of *Leo* to *Flavianus*) wherin he declares every one of thoſe *Three Chapters*, to be repugnant to the faith and decrees of the ancient Councells. By this decretall inſtruction of *Pelagius* the ſecond, were thoſe Italian defenders of the *Three Chapters*, after twenty yeares, and more, reduced as *Bede* noteth, to the unity of the Church, and to approve of the fift Councell. Had *Vigilius* made, as *Baronius* fancieth, the like decree, why tooke it not the like effect in thoſe Weſterne Biſhops? was there more then *Apoſtolicall* authority and inſtruction in the decree of *Pelagius*? or was there leſſe then that in the decree of *Vigilius*?

6. Nay there is another ſpeciall point to bee obſerved concerning that Epiſtle of *Pelagius*, *Elias* Biſhop of *Aquileia*, and the reſt who defended the *three Chapters*, among other reaſons urged the authority of *Vigilius* [f] *on their part, therby countenancing their error, in that they taught no other doctrine in defending thoſe Chapters then the Apoſtolicall See* had taught by *Vigilius*; thus writ they in their Apology which they ſent to *Pelagius*, aiming no doubt at that *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution* of *Vigilius* pub-

[u] *Bed. lib. de ſex Ætatib. anno mundi, 4657.*
[x] *Sigon. lib. 20. de Occid. Imper. an. 554. in fine.*
[y] *Ob imperitiam fidei 5. Concilium ſuſcipere diffidit Synodus Aquileiæ. Bed. loc. cit.*
[z] *Sigon. loc. cit.*
[a] *Bed. loc. cit.*
[b] *Apud Bedam legitur (beati Sergij) qui vixit annis 130. poſt Vigilium, eundē errorem ſequitur Platina, & alij. Sed legendum eſſe Pelagij non Sergij, conſtat ex Ivone, cujus verba ex decreto citat Sigonius, loco cit. at. & ibid. ex Beda legitur Pelagij.*
[c] *Vigilius obijt, an. 556. juxta Baron. Pelagius autem 2. cepit an. 577. juxta eundem Bar.*
[d] *Ea eſt 7. Pelagij 2.*
[e] *Bin. Not. ad eam Epiſtolam Pelagij.*
[f] *Rurſus per Epiſtolam veſtram dicitur. A ſede Apoſtolica vos doctos & confirmatos ne huic rei (i. Synodo quintæ & condemnationi trium Capitulorū) conſentire debeatis, --- Sedes Apoſtolica per Vigilium reſtitit. Pelag. Epiſt. 7. §. Rurſum.*

published in the time of the Councell, whereby hee decreed that the *Three Chapters* ought by all to be defended: *for that was it as the Cardinall* [g] saith, *which moved, nay enforced all to follow that opinion, and to defend the Three Chapters.* What doth *Pelagius* now answer to this reason? Truly had *Vigilius* made any such later *Decree*, as the Cardinall fancieth, by which he had approved the fift Synod, and so both condemned the *three Chapters*, and repealed his owne former judgement in defence thereof; neither could *Pelagius* have beene ignorant of that decree, neither would he, being so earnestly pressed therewith, have omitted that oportunity, both to grace *Vigilius*, and most effectually confute that which was the speciall reason on which his opposites did relye. Could he have truly replyed, that *Vigilius* himselfe upon better advise had recalled his Decree made in defence of those Chapters, and by his last *Apostolicall* judgement condemned the same Chapters, this had cut insunder the very sinewes of that objection. But *Pelagius* returnes them not this answer, but knowing that to bee true which they said of *Vigilius*, hee tells them (which is a point worthy observing) that the *Apostolike See might change* [h] *their judgement in this cause* (and this even by *Pelagius* himselfe is a cause of faith,) *and that the ignorance of the Greeke* [i] *in the Westerne Bishops was the cause why they so lately consented to the fift Synod.* And so though *Vigilius* had judged that the *Three Chapters* ought to be defended, yet the successors of *Vigilius* might long after, as they did, [k] teach, and himselfe define, that the same Chapters ought to bee condemned, and that the fift Councell wherein they were condemned, ought to bee approved. A very strong inducement, that *Pelagius* knew not, and then that *Vigilius* made not any such *Decree* as the Cardinall commendeth unto us.

7. For any *Apostolicall Decree* then, whereby *Vigilius* after his exile recalled his former judgment, or approved the fift Councell, there was none, as besides those reasons which the Cardinall himselfe giveth, the persisting of the Westerne Churches in defence of those Chapters, not onely after the death of *Vigilius*; but till the time of *Pelagius* the second, makes evident. If *Vigilius* at all consented to the Synod after the end thereof, it was onely by some private or personall, but not by any decretall or *Pontificall* approbation. And if the reasons or pretences of *Baronius* prove ought at all, this is the most that can be collected from them. And this though wee should grant and yeeld unto them, yet can it no way helpe their cause, or excuse the Popes *Cathedrall* judgment from being *fallible*, onely it would serve, to save *Vigilius* himselfe from dying an heretike, or under the *Anathema* of the holy Councell. For as they teach, and teach it with ostentation, as a matter of great wit and subtilty, that the Pope may erre *personally*, or in his owne person hold an heresie, which onely hurts himselfe, and not the Church, but erre *doctrinally*, or judicially define an heresie he cannot, even so (to pay them with their owne coine) might it fall out at this time with *Vigilius*; hee being wearied with long exile, might perhaps for his owne person condemne the *Three Chapters*, and approve the Synod, which may be called a *personall* truth, or a personal profession in the Pope, the benefit wherof was

[g] *Vigilius amplissimis scriptis contrariam sententiam (ei quae in quinta Synodo definita est,) professus est, & ad eam sectandam universam ecclesiam catholicam impulit. Bar. an. 554. nu. 6.*

[h] *Cur mutatio sententiae huic sedi in crimine objcitur. Pelag. Epist. 7. §. Debet.*

[i] *Latini homines & Graecitatis ignari dum linguam nesciunt, errorem tarde cognoverunt. Pelag. ibid. §. Rursum.*

[k] *Praedecessorum nostrorum in hac causa consensus tanto post inanis non fuit, ibid.*

§ *Debet. An illud Tanto post, referri potuit ad decretum Vigilij editum anno proxime sequenti post Concilium 5. non potest.*

was onely to redound to himſelfe, either to free him from the cenſure of the Synod, or procure the Emperors favour, & goodwill, that he might returne home to his See, but that this profeſſing (ſuppoſing he made it) was *doctrinall* or *Cathedrall*, delivered *ex officio* by the Pope as Pope, ſo that by it he entended to bind the whole Church to doe the like, neither *Baronius*, nor any of all his favourers can ever prove. Now were I ſure that the Cardinall, or his friends, would be content with this grant of a *perſonall* truth in Pope *Vigilius*, I could be willing to let it paſſe for currant without further examination. But alas, they are no men of ſuch low thoughts and lookes, their eyes are ever upon the Supremacie and *Infallibilitie* of the Popes judgement: As *perſonall* errors hurt them not, ſo *perſonall* truths helpe them not, *Baronius* will either have this conſent of *Vigilius* to bee *Iudiciall*, *Doctrinall*, *Apoſtolicall*[l], and *Cathedrall*, or he will have none at all. And therefore to demonſtrate how farre *Vigilius* was frō decreeing this, I will now enter into a further diſcuſſion of this point then I firſt intended, not doubting to make it evident, that none of all the Cardinalls reaſons are of force to prove ſo much as a private or *perſonall* conſent in *Vigilius* to condemne the *Three Chapters*, and approve the fift Councell, after the end of the fift Synod, or after that exile which the Cardinall ſo often mentioneth.

l *Ante reviſſim ꝫ Apoſtolicæ ſedis aſſenſum. Bar. an. 546. nu. 38. itidemq; ejus ſucceſſoribus licuit, in ipſius Vigilij abſinthe Decretum. Bar. an. 553. nu. 231. Quintam Synodum Apoſtolica authoritate comprobavit. an. 554. nu. 7.*

8. The Cardinalls reaſons to prove this, are three: The firſt is taken from the teſtimonie of *Evagrius* [m], who then lived. *Nicephorus*, *Cedrenus*, *Zonaras*, *Photius*, and all Greeke writers, *Græci* [n] *omnes affirmant*, they all teſtifie *Vigilius* to have aſſented to this fift Councell, and that by letters, or by a booke, whence the Cardinall collects, that ſeeing he conſented not either during the time of the Synod, or ſhortly after, for he was ſent into baniſhment, becauſe he would not conſent unto it, *neceſſe eſt affirmare* [o] *id ab ipſo factū eſſe hoc tempore, cum ab exilio ſolutus eſt, liberque dimiſſus; It muſt of neceſsitie be affirmed, that he conſented at that time when he was freed from exile, and diſmiſſed home to Rome.* Thus *Baronius*: whom I will never beleeve to have been ſo ſimple and ignorant, as that he knew not, how lame, defective, and unſound this his neceſſarie collection was. That his *Neceſſe eſt*, is meerly inconſequent, it is not ſo good as *Contingens eſt*. That *Vigilius* conſented by a booke, or letters, to the Synod, is certaine, none that I know makes doubt of it, and that is all that *Evagrius*, or any of his other witneſſes affirme: but neither *Evagrius*, nor any one of them ſaith, that *Vigilius* conſented to the Synod after the end thereof, or after he was ſent into baniſhment: this and this onely is it which wee deny, and which *Baronius* undertakes to prove: but when he comes to his proofe, hee ſtill, and that moſt fraudulently, omitteth this which is the principall, nay the onely verbe in the ſentence. And to prove that *Vigilius* conſented to the Synod in condemning the three Chapters, what needed the Cardinall to cite all, or any one of the Greeke writers? The very Acts of the fift Councell doe often and expreſly teſtifie this, *Vigilius* hath [p] often by writings, without writing condemned, and anathematized the *Three Chapters*. In the very Synodall ſentence, [q] it is ſaid, It hath happened that *Vigilius*, living in this City, hath beene preſent at

m Bar. an. 553. nu. 223.

n Bar. an. 554. nu 4.

o Ibid.

q *Act. Conc. 5. Coll. 1. pa. 520. a. & Coll. 7. pa. 578. a.*

q *Collat. 8. pa. 584. a.*

at thoſe things which are noted concerning theſe Chapters, *& tam ſine ſcriptis, quam in ſcriptis ea ſæpius condemnaſſe, and to have condemned the ſame as well by writing as by word.* The whole purpoſe of the ſeventh Collation is no other but to ſhew out of *Vigilius* own writings, that he conſented with the Councell in condemning the *three Chapters*, the very letters of *Vigilius*, which were read in that ſeventh Collation, do clearely witneſſe his conſent and judgement in condemning thoſe Chapters. The Councell condemnes them, *Vigilius* condemnes them; Doth not *Vigilius* conſent to, and with the Synod? Did he not *per libellum, & literas*, expreſſe that aſſent, when his owne Epiſtles teſtifie that he condemned thoſe Chapters, as did alſo the Synod: wherefore of his conſent to the Synod there is no doubt. But this conſent of his was before the time that the Councell made their Synodall Decree, yea before they aſſembled in the Synod, it was during the time of the ſecond Period, before mentioned, ſhortly after his cõming to *Conſtantinople*, untill the Councell met together, all that time he conſented in judgement with the Councell, he condemned the Chapters, as the Councell did. But at the time of the Councell, when *Vigilius* ſhould have conſented alſo in making the Synodall *Decree* for condemning of thoſe Chapters, then hee diſſented from the Synod and publiſhed an *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution* in defence of the *Three Chapters*. So he both conſented and that by letters, yea by his Decree, with the Synod, and withall he diſſented, and that alſo by his Decree, from the Synod. His conſent, which the Synodall Acts doe ſhew and teſtifie, *Evagrius* and the reſt who ſaw and therein followed the Acts, report and that truly. His diſſent, which his owne *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution* kept in their Vaticane doth ſhew and teſtifie, & which in likelyhood *Evagrius* ſaw not, nor knew thereof, they report not, but they deny it not. But for that Baronian conſent after the end of the Synod, or after his exile, of that in *Evagrius* and the reſt there is no mention, nor any ſmall ſignification.

9. It is the precedent conſent of *Vigilius*, not that Baronian and ſubſequent conſent, of which *Evagrius* and the reſt intreat, which may appeare even by the very words of *Evagrius*. *Vigilius* [r] *per literas conſenſit Concilio, non tamen intereſſe voluit*. He ſaith not, *Vigilius would not be preſent at the Councell, but after the end of it hee conſented by letters, unto it*, (this is the falſe and corrupt gloſſe of *Baronius*) but *Vigilius* conſented to the Councell by his letters, but would not be preſent. His conſent by letters was the former, his deniall to come was the later. For when *Evagrius* ſaith, *conſenſit, ſed noluit intereſſe*, he plainely ſheweth that *Vigilius* might have beene preſent in the Councell, as well as have conſented by his letters, he might, but he would not: now had his conſent beene after his returne from exile, that is, an whole yeare after the end of the Councell, *Vigilius* could not poſſibly, though hee would never ſo gladly, have beene preſent in the Councell, nor would *Evagrius* have ſaid, *conſenſit ſed noluit intereſſe*, but hee ſhould have ſaid, *conſenſit ſed non potuit intereſſe, hee conſented indeed with the Synod, but he could not be preſent in it*, becauſe when he conſented, the Synod was diſſolved, and ended a yeare before. The ſenſe in *Nicephorus*

[r] Evag. lib. 4. ca. 37.

is

is the very ſame, but his words a little more cleare, *Vigilius*, ſaith he [s], *etſi ſcripto interveniente cum Eutichio conveniret, aſsidere tamen illi noluit, although he agreed with Eutichius, by a writing,* (this as it ſeemes was his Epiſtle to *Ruſticus* and *Sebaſtianus* read in the Synod) *yet hee would not ſit with him in the Councell.* Importing hereby that *Vigilius* might alſo have ſitten with *Eutichius*, when hee conſented in doctrine with him, but he would not: which is evidently to bee underſtood of his precedent, not of any ſubſequent conſent after the end of the Synod. The very ſame is the meaning of *Photius*, Though [t] *Vigilius* was not forward to come to the ſacred aſſembly, *communem tamen patrum fidem libello confirmavit, yet he confirmed the ſame common faith*, (marke, the ſame faith, ſo he accounts the cauſe of the *Three Chapters* to be a cauſe of faith, and the condemning of them to bee the confirming of the faith) by a booke, which booke is the ſame that *Evagrius* and *Nicephorus* meant, the booke, Epiſtle, or *Conſtitution* of *Vigilius*, made before the time of the Councell, and then read therein; but of any confirming that common faith by *Vigilius* after the end of the Synod, *Photius* hath not one ſyllable.

[s] *Nicep. lib. 17. ca. 27.*

[t] *Phot. lib. de 7. Synod. in Conc. 5*

10. Now whereas the Cardinall [u] adds, that *Græci omnes de conſenſione Vigilij affirment, that all Greeke writers affirme Vigilius to have conſented to the Councell*, it is nothing but an untrue, and vaine bragge of *Baronius* to downeface the truth, for *Zonaras* affirmes it not, nor *Cedrenus* (and yet both theſe are expreſly named by the Cardinall to write this) nor *Glicas*, nor *Conſtantinus Manaſſes*, nor the Cardinalls owne *Theophanes*. And yet if we ſhould admit them to ſay the like, or the ſame with *Evagrius*, *Nicephorus*, and *Photius*, that *Vigilius* did conſent to the Synod by a booke or letters, yet what one of all the Greek writers, yea or Latine either, can the Cardinall produce to ſay that which he doth, that *Vigilius* after the end of the Synod, or after hee was ſent into baniſhment, conſented to the Synod? That by his precedent letters, and judiciall ſentence he conſented to the ſame faith, which the Synod decreed, is true; this the Cardinall doth, but ſhould not prove; but that by a ſubſequent cõſent or writing he approved the Synod after his owne exile, t his none of the Cardinals witneſſes affirme, this the Cardinall ſhould, but neither doth nor can prove.

[u] *Bar. an. 554. nu. 4.*

11. His ſecond reaſon is taken from the fact of *Iuſtinian* in reſtoreing *Vigilius*. *The Emperor*, ſaith he [x], *was moſt carefull for the condemning of the Three Chapters, and therefore puniſhed ſeverely ſuch as withſtood his Edict and the Decree of the Synod*: how then could hee have endured *Vigilius* to have beene freed from exile, & to returne into the Weſt, *niſi conſenſiſſet, unleſſe he had conſented to the Synod?* Seeing otherwiſe *Vigilius* would have ſtird up all the Biſhops in the Weſt againſt the Emperors Edict, and the Synodall ſentence. Now that the Emperor did free *Vigilius* from exile, and permit him to returne to the Weſt, *Baronius* [y] proves that, by *Anaſtaſius* [z], out of whom hee relates, *that the whole Romane Clergie entreated* Narſes *that he would be a meanes to the Emperor to reſtore unto the Vigilius, & the reſt who were baniſhed with him. The Emperor at the entreatie of* Narſes *ſent preſently to* Giſſa, Proconeſus, *and other places, and called them to him who were baniſhed, and put*

[x] *Bar. an. 554. nu. 6.*

[y] *An. eodem nu. 1. et an. 553. nu. 222. liquet ex Anaſtaſio Vigilium fuiſſe in exilium deportatum, &c.*

[z] *Anaſt. in vita Vigilij.*

put it to their choice, whether [a] *they would have* Vigilius *to be their Pope, or* Pelagius *there preſent among them:* and when they deſired *Vigilius*, *dimiſit omnes cum Vigilio, he ſent them all* [b] *home with Vigilius. Nay the Emperor did not onely reſtore him, and ſend him home, but granted* [c] *divers matters (gifts, rewards, and Priviledges, as* Binius [d] *calleth them) and at his entreatie publiſhed a pragmaticall ſanction for the affaires* of *Italie*, as the words of the ſanction, *Pro petitione Vigilij*, doe declare. Hence now doth the Card: make his inference, that *abſque* [e] *dubio, without all doubt Vigilius* was very deare to the Emperor, ſeeing he granted ſuch favours unto him, but there could have beene no friendſhip at all betwixt thē, unleſſe *Vigilius* after his returne from exile, had conſented to the Synod, and condemned the *Three Chapters*, ſeeing [f] his not conſenting thereunto, was the cauſe of his baniſhment, Thus *Baronius:* who hath very hanſomely concluded, that *abſque dubio, Vigilius* after his returne out of exile, conſented to the fift Councell. If now wee can clear this reaſon, wherein conſiſts the whole pith of the Cardinals cauſe, I well hope that this conſent of *Vigilius*, of which he ſo much boaſteth, will be acknowledged to bee nothing elſe then a Baronian dreame.

12. And firſt admitting for a while the Cardinalls antecedent, the conſequent ſure is inconſequent. *Iuſtinian* might upon the entreatie of *Narſes*, ſend *Vigilius* home, though *Vigilius* had not conſented to the Synod after the end thereof. *Narſes* was a man for his pietie, prudence, fortitude, & felicitie in warre, exceedingly beloved & honored by *Inſtinian*. They who are converſant in hiſtories, are not ignorant that Emperors doe yeeld many times greater matters then the reſtoring of *Vigilius*, at the entreatie of ſuch as *Narſes* was. When the Romane Matrones [g] (their huſbands not daring to motion ſuch a matter) entreated *Conſtantius* to reſtore *Liberius* to his See, from which he was then baniſhed, the Emperour, though he was moſt violently bent againſt *Liberius*, and had placed an other Biſhop in his See, yet, as *Theodoret* writeth, *ſic inflectebatur*, hee was ſo affected with their entreatie, that he yeelded to their requeſt, thinking it fitter that there ſhould be two Biſhops at once in Rome, rather then he would ſeeme ſo obdurate and unkinde, as to deny that petition in the time of his triumph. It was as great incongruitie and diſproportion in the government of *Conſtantius* an Arian, to reſtore *Liberius*, then a Catholike, as for *Iuſtinian* being a Catholike Emperor, to reſtore *Vigilius* being now an hereticall Biſhop. The hatred of *Conſtantius* to *Liberius* was farre greater, then *Iuſtinians* againſt *Vigilius*. The parties entreating are ſo unequall, that *Conſtantius* ſeemes to have yeelded onely for popularitie, and to get the opinion of courtiſie, they having done nothing to merit ſuch favour at his hands: but *Narſes* had by his valor and late victories, not onely won great honor to *Iuſtinian*, and to the whole Empire, but had freed *Italie* from the ſervitude of the *Gothes*, and by that meanes, beſides many other, had merited the love and favour of *Iuſtinian*, who might have ſeemed not onely unkind, but unjuſt in denying the petition of one ſo well deſerving.

13. Nay, what if the intreaty of *Narſes*, and narration of *Anaſta-*

ſius

[a] *Vultis habere Vigilium, ut fuit, Papa veſter? Minuſve? Hic habetis Pelagium Archidiaconum &c. Anaſt. ibid.*

[b] *Liquet ex Anaſtaſio omnes ab exilio pariter revocatos.* Bar. an. 553. nu. 222.

[c] *Alia nonnulla eidem petenti cōceſſit, & ipſo exigente ſanctionē promulgavit.* Bar. an. 554. nu. 6.

[d] *Donis, muneribus, ac privilegijs ornatus in Italiā redire permiſſus fuit.* Bin. notis in Conc. 5. §. *Præſtitit.*

[e] Bar. an. 554. nu. 6.

[f] *Quorum ſolùm cauſa odium conflatum erat, & exilium irrogatum.* Bar. ibid.

[g] Theod. hiſtor. lib. 2. ca. 17.

ſius doe prove the quite contrary to that which *Baronius* from them collects, that *Vigilius* had not conſented to the Synod when hee was reſtored upon that entreaty? *Narſes* did this to gratifie[h] the Romane Clergy, and the Italian Biſhops, who intreated him to bee a meanes for the reſtoring of *Vigilius* unto them. And who, I pray you, were they, or how affected in this cauſe of the *three Chapters*? Truly they were eager in defending of them, and for that cauſe rent and divided from the Eaſterne Churches, as *Baronius*[i] witneſſeth. It had beene no gratifying, but a very heart griefe and vexation to ſuch, to have *Vigilius* the condemner of thoſe Chapters, that is, in their judgement, an heretike, reſtored unto them. It was *Vigilius*, the defender of thoſe Chapters, whom they deſired, for whom *Narſes* intreated, and whom, if any, the Emperour upon his intreaty reſtored; which, by the Anaſtaſian narration, is made very evident, for he[k] ſheweth, how the Emperour upon his ſuggeſtion, *mox miſit juſſiones ſuas, preſently ſent forth his command*, to bring *Vigilius* and the reſt from exile. He ſent not to ſee if they would conſent to the Synod, and upon their conſent to releaſe them; but, without any queſtioning of that matter, hee commands that they, howſoever they ſtood affected, ſhould be free, and brought out of baniſhment; when they were returned, did the Emperour aske them one word, whether they would conſent to the Synod, or no? He did not; but al that he demanded of them was this, *vultis habere* Vigilium, will yee have *Vigilius* to continue your Pope, as hee was before, or will you have *Pelagius*, who is here among you? A demonſtration, that *Vigilius* had not then conſented to the Synod, when the Emperor ſaid this; for there was no cauſe, either to deprive *Vigilius*, or elect any other in his roome, but his perſiſting in hereſie; had he conſented to the Synod, and condemned the *Three Chapters*, the Emperor ſhould have done wrong unto him, to have ſuffered any other to have beene choſen: nay, the See being full, *Pelagius* could not, though all the baniſhed Clergy had deſired it, have beene choſen Biſhop in his ſtead. Seeing then, both the Emperours words, and the anſwer of the Clergy, as *Anaſtaſius* relateth them, doe ſhew, that if they had pleaſed they might lawfully have choſen another Pope; and ſeeing they could not by right have done that, unleſſe *Vigilius* had continued in his pertinacious defence of hereſie; even hereby it may bee perceived, that at his reſtoring he perſiſted in the ſame hereticall minde of which he was before, and that hee had not then conſented to the Synod, nor to the condemning of thoſe *Three Chapters*. So blinded was the Cardinall in this cauſe, that he could not, or rather would not ſee how his owne reaſon, drawne from the intreaty of *Narſes*, and the narration of *Anaſtaſius*, doth quite overthrow the concluſion which by them he intended to confirme.

h *Tunc adunatus clerus rogaverunt Naſſetè, ut rogaret Principem, &c. Anaſt. in vita Vig.*

i *(um (Vigilium) cerneret univerſum Orientem ab Eccleſia Romana diviſum, niſi Synodo conſentiret. Bar. an. 553. nu. 235*

k *Anaſt. in vita Vig.*

14. And all this have I ſaid upon ſuppoſall onely of the truth of that narration touching *Narſes* his intreatie, and the Emperors yeelding thereupon, to reſtore *Vigilius* out of exile. But now I muſt adde another anſwere, which I feare will bee much more diſpleaſing to the Cardinal and his friends, and that is, that this whole narration touching the exile of *Vigilius* after the Synod, the intreaty of *Narſes*, the reſtoring

ſtoring him from that baniſhment, and the reſt depending thereon, is all untrue, & fictitious, ſuch as hath no ground in the whole world, but onely the Cardinals owne Poeticall pate: For the manifeſting whereof I will inſiſt on the two principall points in the Cardinals narration, the untruth of which being declared, all the reſt will eaſily be acknowledged to bee untrue and fabulous.

15. The former concernes the reſtoring of *Vigilius* out of Baniſhment. *Baronius*[l] following *Anaſtaſius*, ſaith, that the Emperour, together with *Vigilius* reſtored all the reſt who were baniſhed with him; *Dimiſit omnes cum* Vigilio; and by name *Pelagius* is expreſſed to bee one of them; of whom the Emperour then ſaid, *Hic habetis* Pelagium, *you have here* Pelagius: *Vigilius* then with him, by name, among the reſt was diſmiſſed home. A very fiction and fable, witneſſe whereof *Victor* Biſhop of *Tunea*, who then lived, and who himſelfe [m], after impriſonment and whipping was baniſhed into three ſeverall places, for defending the *Three Chapters*; and after that was brought to *Conſtantinople* [n], where hee was an eye witneſſe of the moſt things there happening about this cauſe. Hee having ſet downe the time of *Vigilius* death, that he dyed in *Sicily*, in the 16° year after the Coſſ. of *Baſilius*, addeth in the next yeare concerning *Pelagius*, that he, being that yeare called from baniſhment, which he ſuſtained for defence of the *Three Chapters*, did then condemne them, and then was ordained Biſhop of *Rome*, which demonſtrateth the vanity of the Anaſtaſian and Baronian tale: how could the Emperor ſay, You have *Pelagius* here, when *Pelagius* was then, and after that in exile? How did the Emperour diſmiſſe them all, and particularly *Pelagius*, when *Vigilius* was ſent home, ſeeing *Pelagius* remained in exile till *Vigilius* was dead? But that which I principally collect is this: Seeing *Vigilius*, by the Cardinals narration, was not freed from exile, nor conſented to the Synod, but at the ſame time when *Pelagius* was releaſed; and ſeeing it is certaine, by the teſtimony of *Victor*, that *Vigilius* was not freed, nor conſented unto the Synod at that time, (for *Vigilius* was dead before *Pelagius* was releaſed) it hence certainly enſueth, that *Vigilius* neither was freed from exile, nor at all conſented unto the fift Synod after his exile.

16. The other, which is indeed the ſpeciall point, concernes the baniſhment of *Vigilius* after the end of the Synod, which *Baronius* ſo often mentioneth, and on which depends the whole fable; this baniſhment being in very deed nothing elſe than a Baronian fiction; the author, and the onely author whom *Baronius* names for proofe of this baniſhment, is *Anaſtaſius*: and becauſe the Cardinall in good diſcretion would name the beſt author, and authority which hee had; him, whoſe antiquity and name might gaine credit to the narration: it is not to bee doubted but *Anaſtaſius* was the beſt, moſt credible, and authentike author, which the Cardinall had for this baniſhment: of him then *Baronius* [p] ſaith thus, *Liquet ex* Anaſtaſio Vigilium *in exilium deportatum fuiſſe*; *It is evident by* Anaſtaſius, *that* Vigilius *and thoſe who were with him were caried into baniſhment*. True; that is evident indeed by *Anaſtaſius*: But why did the Cardinall omit the principall point to be proved? why ſaid he not, *Vigilius* to have been caried into baniſhment

l Bar. 554. nu. 1.

m *Victor Tunnenſis author hujus operis, poſt cuſtodias ſimul et plagas primo et ſecundo exilio egi Mauritaniæ, tertio Alexandrinæ, pro trium capitulorum defenſione. Vict. in Chron. an. 14. (corrupte legitur 15.) poſt Cõſul. Baſily.*

n *Iſid. lib. de viris illuſt. ca. 25. ex Ægypto rurſus Conſtantinopolin evocatus, &c.*

d *Corrupte legitur 17. in Chron. Vict.*

p Bar. an. 553. nu. 2. 2.

ment

ment after the end of the Synod, or caried for not conſenting with the Synod in their condemning of the *Three Chapters*? why ſaid he not, this is evident by *Anaſtaſius*? Will you be pleaſed to know the reaſon herof? It is this, becauſe, *hoc non liquet ex* Anaſtaſio; nay, becauſe, *contrarium liquet ex* Anaſtaſio, *Anaſtaſius* is ſo farre from ſaying as the Cardinall doth, that *Vigilius* was baniſhed after the end of the Councell, or for not conſenting to the Councell, that hee ſaith the quite contrary, and contradicteth all that the Cardinall hath ſaid touching that baniſhment, both for the time, and for the cauſe thereof. The cauſe of the Anaſtaſian baniſhment [q] of *Vigilius* was, for that hee refuſed to reſtore *Anthimus* to the See of *Conſtantinople*, whence hee was juſtly ejected by Pope *Agapetus*, and a generall Councell, more than ten [r] yeares before *Vigilius* came to *Conſtantinople*, and the time of this Anaſtaſian baniſhment was two yeares after [s] *Vigilius* came to *Conſtantinople*, and while *Theodora* [t] was alive, which was long before the fiſt Synod was aſſembled. This, and no other baniſhment of *Vigilius* is to be found in *Anaſtaſius*; from this, and no other it is, that *Anaſtaſius* ſaith, he was freed by the entreaty of *Narſes*, remaining an exile untill that time. Now this *ex diametro* fighteth with that exile which *Baronius* hath deviſed, the time of the Baronian baniſhment was after the end [u] of the fiſt Synod, that is, about five [x] yeares after the death of *Theodora*; til then *Baronius* wil acknowledge no baniſhment of *Vigilius*. The cauſe of the Baronian baniſhment was not *Anthimus*, nor the reſtoring of him, but onely [y] his not yeelding to the fiſt Synod, and refuſing to condemne the *Three Chapters*. So the Cardinals owne witneſſe: yea, his onely witneſſe is ſo farre from proving what hee pretends, and affirmes, that upon his narration is demonſtrated the quite contrary: For if *Vigilius* was baniſhed in the life time of *Theodora*, as *Anaſtaſius* declareth, and there remained till by *Narſes* intreaty he was releaſed; then moſt certainly was hee not caſt into baniſhment after the end of the fiſt Synod, nor for refuſing to conſent therunto, which is the fiction of *Baronius*.

16. And for more evidence that the ſame which I ſaid is the baniſhment by *Anaſtaſius*, I might alleage *Bellarmine* [z], and others, but omitting them, let us heare that worthy author, to whom *Binius* [a] referres us concerning this matter; *Nicholas Sanders*, He [b] thus writeth; *That* Vigilius *was ſent into baniſhment, becauſe he would not reſtore* Anthimus: *the Romane Pontificall* (ſo he cals the booke of *Anaſtaſius*) *doth teſtifie*; and beſides it, *Aimonius*, *Paulus Diaconus*, *Marianus Scotus*, *Platina*, *Blondus*, *Petrus de Natalibus*, *Martinus Polonus*, *Sabellicus*, and it may be gathered out of *Nicephorus*. Thus *Sanders*: who might have added *Sigebert* [c], who placeth his baniſhmẽt divers years before the fiſt Councell; *Albo* [d] *Floriacenſis*, who hath the ſame words with *Anaſtaſius*, *Naucle-rus* [d], *Rhegino* [e], *Hermanus* [f] *Cõtractus*, *Gotofridus* [g] *Viterbienſis*, *Otho Friſingenſis* [h], *Palmerius* [i], their owne *Genebrard* [k], *Stapleton* [l], and many others: Theſe following *Anaſtaſius*, relate the cauſe of his baniſhmẽt to have bin the not reſtoring of *Anthimus*; & the time, before the death of the Empreſſe *Theodora*. Nor can I finde ſo much as one, either an-

q *Per biennium fuere contentiones de Anthimo, ſed Vigil. nullatenus voluit conſentire, &c. Anaſt. in vit. Vig.*

r *Conc. illud ſub Menna, ubi Anthimus eſt depoſitus, habitum eſt an. 536. Bar. illo an. nu. 9 a. Vig. venit Conſtantinopolin an. 547. Bar. illo a. nu. 26.*

s *Per biennium &c. Anaſt. loc. cit.*

t *Non ſecerunt me, ut video, venire ad ſe Iuſtinianus et Theodora, ſed Dioclesianus et Eleutheria. Anaſt. Ibid.*

u *Bar. an. 553. nu. 221. et ſeq.*

x *Nam Theodora obyit an. 548. Bar. eo an. nu. 26 Cõc. 5. habitũ an. 553. Bar. eo an.*

y *Pontifex (Vigilius) non aliam ob cauſam in exilium actus eſt, niſi quod 5. Synodum minimè probare voluiſſet Bar. an. 554. nu. 4.*

z *Quo circa (quia noluit Anthimum reſtituere) ab irata Imperatrice, in exilium miſſus fuit Vigilius, & miſerè vexatus uſq; ad mortem. Bell. lib. 4. de Pont. Rom. ca. 10 § Comigit.*

a *De Vigilio et tota ejus cauſa vid. Sanderum. Bin. not. in vit. Vigil. pa. 478. b.*

b *Sand. lib. 7. de viſib. Monarch. ad an. 537.*

c *Sig. an. 546.*

d *Alb. Flor. in vita Vig.*

Naucl. an. 540.

e *Rheg. an. 553.*

f *Herm. an. 547.* g *Gotof. an. 527.* h *Otho an. 528.* i *Palm. in Chr. an. 537.* k *Geneb. an. 537.* l *Stapl. Counterbl. ca. 14.*

cient

cient or later writer, who ſaith, with *Baronius*, that hee was baniſhed after the fift Councell, and for refuſing to conſent unto it; what a rare Poeticall conceit hath the Cardinall, who can make ſuch a noble diſcourſe of that fictitious baniſhment, and commend it as an hiſtoricall narration, for the warrant of which he had not ſo much as one writer (and one is a ſmall number) ancient or late, upon whoſe credit and authoritie he might report it; and for that one witneſſe *Anaſtaſius*, whom he nameth, he is ſo farre from teſtifying it, that he doth clearely teſtifie the quite contrary; yea, *Baronius* himſelfe was not ignorant hereof, but knew right well *Anaſtaſius* to referre [m] the beating of *Vigilius*, his flight to *Chalcedon*, the other indigne uſage ſet downe by him, and his exile, to the time while *Theodora* lived; and therefore hee taxeth *Anaſtaſius*, for confounding thoſe things, and referring them to that time, whereas himſelfe placeth them after the death [n] of *Theodora*: And yet for all this, though he knew *Anaſtaſius* to teach the quite contrary, yet was not the Cardinall afraid, nor aſhamed to alleage *Anaſtaſius* for a witneſſe, that *Vigilius* was caſt into baniſhment after the fift Councell, and for refuſing to conſent unto it, and to ſay of this baniſhment, *Liquet ex* Anaſtaſio, *it is clearly knowne out of* Anaſtaſius; whereas not that, but the quite contrarie, *Liquet ex* Anaſtaſio.

17. From hence now there iſſueth another conſequent to bee remembred. It is agreed by all, who mention any baniſhment of *Vigilius*, and it is confeſſed alſo by *Baronius*, that *Vigilius* was but once baniſhed, and from that one freed by the intreaty of *Narſes*: Now that one cannot bee the Baronian baniſhment, for of it there is no proofe at all to bee found, no one author to witneſſe it, but the Cardinall and his owne αὐτοσχεδία, which in matters of fact done ſome thouſand and more yeares before the Cardinall was borne, is of no worth at all, nor can be eſteemed ought but one of his owne dreames and figments. Againe, that one cannot bee the Anaſtaſian baniſhment, which is ſaid to happen before the death of *Theodora*, more than foure yeares before the fift Councell; for it is certaine by the Acts of the fift Synod [o], that *Vigilius* at that time was at *Conſtantinople*; yea, that untill then he lived and dwelt [p] at *Conſtantinople*. Seeing then *Vigilius* was neither baniſhed before the Councell, as *Anaſtaſius* ſaith, nor baniſhed after the Councell, as *Baronius* ſaith, it followeth, which indeed is very truth, that *Vigilius* was not at all baniſhed, but all which is reported of his baniſhment, and all that depends thereon, is fictitious and Poeticall, deviſed by two *Bibliothecarij* to his Holineſſe; the former, and precedent to the Councell, is an Anaſtaſian; the other, following the Councell, is a Barbarian Poeme; but both Poems both fabulous and Æſopicall narrations.

18. And truly, might wee be allowed to imitate the Cardinals Arte in diſputing, this matter would eaſily be made plaine. There is one Topicke place of arguing *à teſtimonio negativè*, which is very familiar to *Baronius* in his *Annals* [q], and it is defended by *Gretzer* in his Apology [r] for *Baronius*; let us take but one example, and that alſo in this our preſent cauſe concerning *Vigilius*. There is in *Anaſtaſius* [s] a narration, how *Vigilius* was violently puld away from *Rome* by

[m] *Hoc plane tempore acciderunt, quæ Anaſtaſius fingit, imo confundit cum prioribus, quæ acciderunt vivente adhuc Theodora.* Bar. an. 552. nu. 8.

[n] *Cætera quæ ſequuntur (in Anaſtaſio) poſt obitum Theodoræ contigerunt.* Bar. an. 547. nu. 17. *Inter illa vetera eſt Vigilij exilium.*

[o] *Conc. 5. Coll. 1, c. 3, et 8.*

[p] *Contigit Vigilium in hac regia urbe degentem, omnibus intereſſe, &c. Coll. 8. pa. 584. a.*

[q] *Vid. Bar. an. 774. nu. 10. et 11.*

[r] *Reſpondiſſemus hanc argumentandi rationem (ab authoritate negativè) in eis præſertim quæ ad hiſtoriam ſpectant, non eſſe prorſus infirmam et vlam. Gretz. Apol. pro Bar. ca. 1.*

[s] *Peritius.*

[t] *Anaſt. in vit. Vigil.*

by *Anthemius Scribonius*, ſent thither for that purpoſe, by the Empreſſe; how he was apprehended in the Church, thruſt into the ſhippe; how the Romanes followed reviling [t] him, curſing him, and caſting ſtones and dung at him, praying that a miſchiefe might goe with him. Thus it is hiſtorified by *Anaſtaſius*. The like is mentioned by many others, who borrowed it out of *Anaſtaſius*; by *Aimonius* *, by the *Hiſtoria Miſcella* [u], going under the name of *Paulus Diaconus*, though it be not his; by *Marianus* [x] *Scotus*, by *Hermanus* [y] *Contractus*, by *Sigebert* [z], by *Luitprandus* [a] *de vitis Pontificum*, as the booke is called; by *Albo* [b] *Floriacenſis*, by *Platina* [c], by *Conrade* [d], by *Nauclerus* [e], by *Martinus* [f] *Polonus*, by *Blondus* [g], by *KrantZius* [h], by *Sigonius* [i], & others. Heare now the Cardinals cenſure of this narration of *Anaſtaſius*, and the reſt who followed him; *Aperti mendacij* [k] *redarguitur Anaſtaſius*; *Anaſtaſius is convicted of a manifeſt lye herein*; and how prove you that, my *Baronius? res adeo ignominioſa, ſo ignominious a matter as this is*, could not have beene unknowne to the Authors, who writ moſt accurately the Acts of their times, and thoſe were *Facundus* and *Procopius*, the Cardinall names no moe: from the ſilence and omiſſion of this matter in them two, he concludes *Anaſtaſius* to be a lyar, and his narration, ſeconded by many moe, to be a lye.

19. Let now but the like liberty of diſputing *à Teſtimonio negativè*, be allowed unto us, and the Baronian baniſhment (to begin with that) muſt be rejected, baniſhed, and ſet in the ſame ranke with that lye of *Anaſtaſius*; for thus wee may argue: This baniſhment of *Vigilius* after the end of the fift Councell, and for refuſing to conſent unto it, is neither mentioned by *Victor* Biſhop of *Tunen*, nor by *Liberatus*, nor by *Evagrius*, nor by *Procopius*, who all then lived, (and in relating the affaires of the Church, were full out as exact as *Facundus* and *Procopius*) nor by *Photius*, nor by *Zonaras*, nor by *Cedrenus*, nor by *Nicephorus*, nor by *Glicas*, nor by *Conſtantinus Manaſſes*, nor by *Anaſtaſius*, nor by *Paulus Diaconus*, nor by *Aimonius*, nor by *Luitprandus*, nor by *Alba Floriacenſis*, nor by *Otho Friſingenſis*, nor by *Conrade* Abbat of *Vrſberge*, nor by *Hermanus Contractus*, nor by *Sigebert*, nor by *Lambertus Scaffnaburgenſis*, nor by *Martinus Polonus*, nor by *Gotofridus Viterbienſis*, nor by *Albertus Stadenſis*, nor by *Vernerus*, nor by *Marianus Scotus*, nor by *Rhegino*, nor by *Bede*, nor by *Platina*, nor by *Nauclerus*, nor by *Triteminus*, nor by *KrantZius*, nor by the *magnum Chronicon Belgicum*, nor by the *Chronicon Reicherſpergenſe*, nor by *Chronicõ Germanicum per Monachũ Herveldenſem*, nor by *Chronica Compendioſa*, or *Compilatio Chronologica*, nor by *Blondus*, nor by *Sabellicus*, nor by *Aventinus*, nor by *Huldericus Mutius*, nor by *Sigonius*, nor by *Palmerius*, nor by *Karantz*, nor by *Papirius Maſſonius*, nor by *Genebrard*, nor by *Sanders*, nor by *Stapleton*; and I challenge the welwillers of *Baronius*, by that love they beare unto him, & his eſtimatiõ, to name if they can but any one writer before *Baronius*, who affirmeth *Vigilius* to have beene baniſhed after the Synod, for not conſenting unto it; that thereby it may be knowne, that their great Annaliſt playes the Hiſtorian, and not the Poet, in relating the Eccleſiaſticall affaires of the Church: Or if they can at any time doe this, (which I am verily perſwaded they neither will, nor ever can performe)

[t] *Populus cepit jactare poſt eum lapides, fuſtes, et cacabos, et dicere, Fames tua tecum, male invenias, ubi vadis, &c.*

* *Aim. lib. 2. de geſt. Franc. ca. 32.*

[u] *Hiſt. miſc. lib. 16.*

[x] *Mar. an. 553.*

[y] *Her. an. 547.*

[z] *Sig. an. 543.*

[a] *Luitp. in vita Vigil.*

[b] *Alb. in vita Vig.*

[c] *Plat. in vita Vig.*

[d] *Conr. Ab. Vrſper. an. 527.*

[e] *Nauc. an. 540.*

[f] *Mart. in vita Vig.*

[g] *Blond. Dec. 1. lib. 6.*

[h] *Krant. Met. lib. 2.*

[i] *Sigeb. lib. 19. de Occ. Imp. an. 545.*

[k] *Bar. an. 546. nu. 54.*

forme) yet ſeeing none of all theſe doe mention that baniſhment; truly if *Baronius*, from the ſilence of two writers, might conclude againſt *Anaſtaſius*, that he was a lyar in the former narration, I thinke none will deny; but *à fortiori*, it will follow, that ſeeing more than two ſcore are ſilent in this matter, it may farre more juſtly bee ſaid, *aperti mendacij redarguitur*, which is the Cardinals owne doome and words that hee beſtoweth on *Anaſtaſius*: and here much more fitly may the Cardinals reaſon take place, *res adeo ignominioſa, ſo ignominious a matter*; nay, ſo glorious a peece of martyrdome on the Popes part, as the baniſhment and cruell perſecution of the Pope, the chiefe Biſhop in the world, for ſuch a cauſe, as for not aſſenting to the Synod, could not have bin unknowne unto thoſe writers, who moſt diligently proſecute the affaires of their times, and ſuch as concerned the Church: Nay, from the moſt of theſe wee may draw an affirmative argument alſo, and reaſon, more ſtrongly than the Cardinall doth in his diſputes. *Anaſtaſius*, *Aimonius*, *Diaconus*, *Platina*, and divers moe of the forenamed authors, to the number at leaſt of twenty, affirme, *Vigilius* was baniſhed before the Synod, and in the life time of *Theodora*; and withall teach but one baniſhment of *Vigilius*, and therefore they not onely are ſilent of that which the Cardinal ſaith, but they ſay the quite contrary unto him; and ſo, both by their ſilence, and by their ſpeech refute that, as an untruth, which the Cardinal ſo poſitively and hiſtorically narrateth.

20. Now, as the negative kinde of arguing diſproves the Baronian, ſo doth it alſo the Anaſtaſian baniſhment, and forcibly concludes, that *Vigilius* was not at all baniſhed, either before, or after the Councel; for there is no baniſhmẽt at all of *Vigilius* mentioned, either by *Victor*, or by *Liberatus*, or by *Evagrius*, or by *Procopius*, who all lived & writ at that time, or by *Photius*, or by *Zonaras*, or by *Cedrenus*, or by *Glicas*, or by *Conſtantinus Manaſſes*, or by *Nicephorus*, or by *Aimonius* (though *Sanders* falſely affirmed them to teach this) or by *Luitprandus*, or by *Bede*, or by *Krantzius*, or by *Mutius*, or by *Papirius Maſſonius*, or by *Caranza*, beſides others. Adde now here againe the Cardinals words, *Res adeo ignominioſa*, ſurely ſo ignominious and ſhameſull a fact, as the baniſhing of a Pope, could not have beene unknowne to thoſe who writ (as exactly as *Facundus* and *Procopius*) the Eccleſiaſticall affaires, and occurrents in their times; and therfore ſeeing theſe ſo many, ſo exact writers, mention not that Anaſtaſian baniſhment of *Vigilius*, it may be rightly concluded, that *Anaſtaſius* therin *aperti mendacij redarguitur*; or if none but the Cardinall may give the lye to *Anaſtaſius*; yet, confeſſing his narration to be untrue, let us leave that as a priviledge of the Cardinals, that he alone ſhal beſtow lies, for liveries, upon *Anaſtaſius*. Nay, ſeeing none of theſe Writers mention any baniſhment at all of *Vigilius*, it muſt further be concluded from their ſilence, that *Vigilius* neither firſt nor laſt, neither before, nor after the Synod was baniſhed, but that the whole narration, touching his baniſhment, is a meere fiction and fable, deviſed, partly by *Anaſtaſius*, and partely by *Baronius*.

21. Which may much rather be affirmed, conſidering that *Victor* who

who was himſelfe exiled, and brought to *Conſtantinople*, is not onely careful, but even curious; (that I ſay not proud) in recounting the moſt eminent perſons, ſpecially Biſhops, which were either depoſed, or impriſoned, or baniſhed about this cauſe of the *three Chapters*, either before or after the Synod. In this ranke he [l] nameth *Benenatus* Biſhop of *Iuſtinianea*, *Zoilus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, *Reparatus* Biſhop of *Carthage*, *Verecundus* Biſhop of *Nica*, *Macarius* Biſhop of *Ieruſalem*, *Ruſticus* a Romane Deacon, *Fælix* a Monke of *Guilla*, *Frominus* Biſhop of *Salone*, *Theodoſius* Biſhop of *Sebarſuſe*, himſelfe being Biſhop of *Tunen*, and *Pelagius* then a Deacon, but afterwards Biſhop of *Rome*, and ſucceſſor to *Vigilius*. Had *Baronius* this negative argument *à teſtimonio* in hand, how would hee inſult, and even triumph in it? how eaſily would he perſwade the world, that certainly Biſhop *Victor*, who by name, and ſo particularly, recounteth meaner Biſhops, yea, Deacons and Monkes, who ſuffered baniſhment for this cauſe, would never have omitted the Prince of Biſhops, had hee beene exiled for it, as they were. That one example had graced the defenders of the *Three Chapters*, more than twenty, nay, than twenty hundred beſides, ſeeing by this it would have beene evident, that the Oracle of the world, the *infallible* Iudge had ſealed the truth of that cauſe with his glorious baniſhment, which is a kinde of Martyrdome. *Anaſtaſius*, *Diaconus*, *Otho*, and all the reſt, who ſay he was baniſhed, ſhould have had the lye an hundred times at the Cardinals hands, for ſaying that he was baniſhed, either before or after the Councell, rather than Biſhop *Victor*, who then lived at *Conſtantinople*, and was fellow-partner in thoſe troubles and baniſhments, ſhould have beene thought either ignorant or forgetfull to expreſſe that baniſhment of *Vigilius*, had there beene truly any at all.

l *Vict. in Chron. an. 8. poſt Coſſ. Baſ.*

22. Thus from the Cardinals owne Topicks it is concluded, that both the Anaſtaſian, & the Baronian baniſhments are both fictitious: Nor can I find what they can except againſt our Negative Argument, wch will not more forcibly refute many of the Cardinals diſputes, unleſſe perhaps, as *Gretzer* [m] anſwers in defence of *Baronius*, in another cauſe, that the old Logick rule, *Ex puris negativis nihil ſequi*, holds only in Syllogiſmes, but not in Enthymems (for which ſubtilty I doubt not but the very Sophiſters in our Vniverſities will ſoundly deride him) ſo in this they will ſay, which, with as good warrant and reaſon, they may; that an agument *à teſtimonio negativè*, holds onely in the Cardinals Annals, or when ſomewhat is to be proved for the Pope, or his cauſe; but it never holds when ought makes againſt the Pope, and the Cardinall; or makes for the Proteſtants, and their cauſe.

m *Gretz. Apol. pro Bar. ca. 1. § Reſpondet.*

23. But if *Anaſtaſius*, in this narration be fabulous, what ſhall wee ſay of *Aimonius*, and al thoſe other Writers, who mention this baniſhment of *Vigilius*, as well as doth *Anaſtaſius*? What elſe can bee ſaid, then that which *Ierome* [n] ſaith of divers of the ancient Writers? Before that Southerne Devill *Arius* aroſe at *Alexandria*, *innocenter quædam, & minus cautè loquuti ſunt; the ancients ſpake certaine things in ſimplicitie, and not ſo warily*, which cannot abide the touch, nor avoide the reprehenſion of perverſe men: Or that which Saint *Auſten* [o] obſerves in himſelfe,

n *Hier. Apol. 2. adver. Ruff. pa. 223.*

o *Aug. lib. 3. de doct. Chriſt. ca. 33.*

himſelfe, and *Tyconius*; *Non erat expertus hanc hæreſin*; *Tyconius had not to deale with this hereſie of the Pelagians*, as I have ſaid: It hath made us *multò vigilantiores, diligentioreſque*; *much more diligent, and vigilant*, in ſcanning of this point, than *Tyconius* was, who had no enemy to ſtir up his diligence: Right ſo it fals out betwixt thoſe Writers, and us of this age. *Aimonius, Otho, Platina*, and the reſt found the baniſhment of *Vigilius*, and much like ſtuffe, as it is hiſtoried in *Anaſtaſius*: they, in ſimplicitie and harmeleſſe innocency, tooke it upon his credit. The queſtion about the Popes *Cathedrall Infallibility*, about *Vigilius heretical Conſtitution*, and ſuch like controverſies, were not moved in their dayes, and therefore they ſpake of theſe things, *innocenter, & minùs cautè*, as *Ierome* ſaith of the Fathers; and becauſe they were not diſtruſtfull of *Anaſtaſius*, they writ not ſo warily of theſe matters, as others, whoſe induſtry, by the manifold frauds of *Baronius*, as of another *Arius*, hath beene whetted, and they compelled to ſift the truth more narrowly than they, wanting oppoſites and oppugners, did: It fell out to them as it did to *Ierome* himſelfe. *Ruffinus* had ſet [p] out a book in defence of *Origen*, under the name of *Pamphilus* the Martyr: [p] *Ierome* at the firſt, and for divers yeares, beleeved [q] the booke to have beene indeed written by *Pamphilus*, as *Ruffinus* ſaid it was: *Credidi Chriſtiano, Credidi Monacho*: I never dreamed, that ſuch an horrible wickedneſſe, as to forge writings, and cal them by the name of Martyrs, could come from a Chriſtian, from a Monke, from *Ruffinus*: but when the queſtion about *Origen* was once ſet on foote, *Ierome* then ſought [r] out every corner, every Copie, every Library that hee could come to, and ſo diſcovered the whole forgery. The very like hapned to *Otho*, *Platina*, and the reſt; they found this fabulous narration of the baniſhment of *Vigilius*, and the conſequents upon it, in the booke of *Anaſtaſius*, the Writer of the Popes lives, of the Pontificall, the keeper of the Popes Library, a man of great name and note for learning, one in high favour with the Popes of his time; they never ſuſpected or dreamed that ſuch a man, a Chriſtian, a Monke, that *Anaſtaſius* would deale ſo perfidiouſly, and record ſuch horrible untruths: But now, the queſtion about *Anaſtaſius* credit, and the cauſe of *Vigilius*, which was not moved in their dayes, being ſifted and come to the ſkanning, the whole forgery and falſhood of *Anaſtaſius* is made evident to the world, both in this, and in a number the like narrations. *Anaſtaſius* is not the man the world tooke him for; his writings are full of lyes and fictions: Not the Legendaur more fabulous than *Anaſtaſius*; hee for a long time was the Maſter of the Popes Mint; by his meanes the royall ſtampe of many golden Fathers, yea, of ſome Councels alſo, and infinite hiſtoricall narrations, was ſet upon Braſſe, Lead, and moſt baſe metals; and then being brought, like ſo many *Gibeonites* in old Coates, and mouldy coverings, *Anaſtaſius* gave them an high place, and honourable entertainment in the Popes Librarie, and with them ever ſince hath the Church of God beene peſtered; they paſt for currant among men delighted in darkneſſe, and errours, ſuch as had no need to bring them to the touch; but the light hath now manifeſted them, and made both them and their author to be deteſted.

[p] *Vnus ſub nomine Pamphili à te editus eſt, et; eadem, quæ ſub Pamphili nomine à te ficta ſunt. Hier. Apol. 2. (ont. Ruff. pa. 226.*

[q] *Inter cæteros tranſlatores poſui et hunc librum à Pamphilo editum, ita putans eſſe, ut à te et tuis diſcipulis fuerat, divulgatum. Ibid.*

[r] *Hier. Apol. 3. contra Ruff. pa. 238.*

[ſ] *Hier. locis citat.*

24. You

24. You ſee now the weakneſſe, nay the nullity of the Cardinalls reaſon, even of his *Achilles*, drawne from the Emperours fact, in reſtoring or freeing him from exile; which he would never have done, unleſſe he had conſented to the Synod. For, ſeeing we have proved that *Vigilius* was not at all baniſhed, it clearly thence enſueth, that neither *Narſes* entreated to have him freed from exile, neither did the Emperour upon that entreaty free him from exile, neither did *Vigilius* conſent to the Synod after his exile; and all the other conſequents, which upon this foundation of *Vigilius* his exile the Cardinall builds like ſo many Caſtles in the ayre, they all of themſelves doe now fall to the ground: and which I ſpecially obſerve, it hence followeth, that *Vigilius* did never after the end of the fift Councell conſent unto it, or to the condemning of the *Three Chapters*, either by his *Pontificall* decree, or by his *perſonall* profeſſion: for the Cardinall aſſures us, and delivers it as a truth, which of neceſſity [t] muſt bee granted, that his conſent, (whether perſonall or pontificall) was at no other time, but when he was looſed out of baniſhment.

[t] *Neceſſe eſt aſſirmare. Bar. an. 554. nu. 4.*

25. Now at that time it neither was nor could be; for there was never any ſuch time; nor was hee at all baniſhed, and therefore upon the Cardinals owne words we are aſſured that *Vigilius* after the end of the Synod never revoked his *Conſtitution* publiſhed in defence of the *Three Chapters*, never after that time condemned the *Three Chapters*, or conſented to the Synod, either by any pontificall, or ſo much as by a perſonall profeſſion, but that hee ſtill perſiſted in his hereticall defence of the ſame Chapters, and ſubject to that cenſure of *Anathema*, which the fift Councell denounced againſt all the defenders of thoſe Chapters.

26. Some perhaps will marvell, or demand how it ſhould come to paſſe, that the Emperour, who as wee have ſhewed was ſo rigorous and ſevere in impriſoning, baniſning, and puniſhing the defenders of the *Three Chapters*, and ſuch as yeelded not to the Synod, ſhould wink at *Vigilius* at this time, who was the chiefe and moſt eminent of them all: which doubt *Baronius* alſo [u] moveth, ſaying, he who publiſhed his Edict againſt ſuch as contradicted him, *Num Vigilio pepercit, may wee thinke he would ſpare Vigilius*, and not baniſh him who ſet forth a Conſtitution againſt the Emperours Edict? *Minime quidem*: Truly the Emperour would never ſpare him, ſaith the Cardinall. Yes, the Emperour both would and did ſpare him. Belike the Cardinall meaſures *Iuſtinian* by his owne irefull and revengefull minde. Had the Cardinall beene croſſed and contradicted, nothing but torture, exile, or fire from heaven to conſume ſuch rebells, would have appeaſed his rage. *Iuſtinian* was of a farre more calme, and therefore more prudent ſpirit. *Vigilius* deſerved, and the Emperour might in juſtice for his pertinacious reſiſting the truth, have inflicted upon him either impriſonment, or baniſhment, or depoſition, or death. It pleaſed him to doe none of all theſe, nor to deale with the Pope according to his demerits. *Iuſtinian* ſaw that *Vigilius* was but a weake and ſilly man, one of no conſtancy and reſolution, a very wethercocke in his judgement concerning cauſes of faith: that hee had ſaid and gainſayd the ſame

[u] *Bar. an. 553. nu. 222.*

things, and then by his *Apoſtolicall* authority judicially defined both his ſayings being contradictory, to be true, and truths of the Catholike faith: the Emperour was more willing to pity this imbecility of his judgement, than puniſh that fit of perverſeneſſe which then was come upon him. Had *Vigilius* beene ſo ſtiffe and inflexible as *Victor*, as *Liberatus*, as *Facundus* were, whom no reaſon, nor perſwaſion would induce to yeeld to the truth, its not to be doubted but hee had felt the Emperours indignation as well as any of them. But *Vigilius* like a wiſe man tooke part with both, he was an *Ambodexter*, both a defender, and a condemner of the *three Chapters*, both on the Emperours ſide, and againſt him: and becauſe hee might bee reckoned on either ſide, having given a judiciall ſentence as well for condemning the *three Chapters*, as for defending them: it pleaſed the Emperour to take him at the beſt, and ranke him among the condemners; at leaſt to winke at him as being one of them, and not puniſh him among the defenders of thoſe Chapters.

27. Nor could the Emperour have any way provided better for the peace and quiet of the Church, than by ſuch connivence at *Vigilius*, and letting him paſſe as one of the condemners of thoſe Chapters. The baniſhing of him would have hardned others, and that far more than his conſent after puniſhment would have gained: the former, men would have aſcribed it to judgement; the latter, to paſſion, and wearineſſe of his exile. But now accounting him as a condemner of the *Three Chapters*, if any were led by his authority and judgement, the Emperor could ſhew them, Loe here you have the judiciall ſentence of the Pope for condemning the *three Chapters*: if his authority were deſpiſed by others, then his judiciall ſentence in defence of the Chapters could doe no hurt: and why ſhould the Emperor baniſh him if he did no hurt to the cauſe? nay it was in a manner neceſſary for the Emperour to winke at him, as at a condemner of the *three Chapters*: for he had often teſtified to the Councell, that *Vigilius* had condemned both by words and writings thoſe Chapters, hee ſent the Popes owne letters to the Synod, to declare and teſtifie the ſame: thoſe letters as well of the Emperour as of the Pope teſtifying this, were inſerted into the Synodall Acts [x]. Had the Emperour baniſhed *Vigilius* for not condemning thoſe Chapters, his owne act in puniſhing *Vigilius* had ſeemed to croſſe and contradict his owne letters, and the Synodall Acts. If *Vigilius* be a condemner of the Chapters, as you ſay, and the Synodall Acts record that he is, why doe yee baniſh him for not condemning thoſe Chapters? If *Vigilius* bee juſtly baniſhed as a defender of thoſe Chapters, how can the Emperours letters and Synodall Acts be true, which teſtifie him to be one of the condemners of thoſe Chapters? So much did it concerne the Emperors honour, and credit of the Synod, that *Vigilius* ſhould not be baniſhed at that time. *Vigilius* had ſufficient puniſhment that he ſtood now a convicted, condemned, and anathematized heretike by the judgement of the whole and holy generall Councell: but for any baniſhment, impriſonment, or other corporall puniſhment, the Emperour in his wiſedome, in his lenity thought fit to inflict none upon him. Onely he ſtayed him at

[x] *Conc. 5. Coll. 1. & 7.*

Con-

Conſtantinople for one, or as *Victor* ſaith, for moe yeares after the Synod, to the end that before he returned, the Synodall ſentence and Acts of the Councell being every where divulged, and with them, nay in them the judgement of *Vigilius* in condemning thoſe Chapters as the Synod did, might ſettle if it were poſſible, the mindes of men in the truth, or at leaſt ſerve for an Antidote againſt that poiſon, which either from the contrary conſtitution, or his perſonall preſence when he ſhould returne, could proceed.

28. And by this is eaſily anſwered all that the Cardinall and *Binius* collect from thoſe great offices, gifts, rewards, and priviledges with which the Emperor graced and decked *Vigilius*, and ſo ſent him home: which the Cardinall thinkes the Emperour would never have done, unleſſe *Vigilius* had conſented to the Synod, and condemned the *three Chapters*. Truly theſe men can make a mountaine of a mole-hill. There is no proofe in the world that *Vigilius* was ſo graced at his returne: no nor that the Emperour beſtowed any gifts or rewards upon him at all. That which the Emperour did was the publiſhing of a pragmaticall ſanction, wherein are contained divers very wholeſome lawes, and good orders for the government of *Italy*, and the Provinces adjoyning: The date of the ſanction is in Auguſt, in the eight and twenty yeare of *Iuſtinian*, and thirteene after the Conſ. of *Baſilius*, which was the next yeare after the Councell. But that *Vigilius* at that time returned, there is no ſolid proofe; and *Victor*[y] who then lived, and was preſent at *Conſtantinople*, puts the death of *Vigilius* in the 31. yeare of *Iuſtinian*, or 16. after *Baſilius*, who yet by all mens account (who write of his returne) returned from *Conſtantinople* either in the ſame, or in the next yeare before he dyed. So uncertaine, and by *Victors* account unlikely it is, that *Vigilius* at his returne home was *ornatus muneribus, donis, officiis*, and *privilegiis*, as they[z] pompouſly ſet out the matter. Now it is true that the Emperour ordered and decreed thoſe matters upon the entreaty of *Vigilius*: for ſo the words *pro petitione Vigilij*, doe make evident: but that either *Vigilius* entreated, or the Emperour granted this upon any entreaty which he made, either after his return out of exile, (which certainly he did not) or after the end of the Synod, or at the time of his return (al which are the Cardinals tales without any proofe) none of the Cardinalls friends will bee ever able to make cleare. And for my owne part, till I ſee ſome reaſon to the contrary, I cannot otherwiſe thinke, but that this petition was made by *Vigilius* ſome three or foure yeares before the Councell, at which time *Vigilius* conſented wholly with the Emperor, was in great grace and favour with him. And I am hereunto induced by that which *Procopius*[a] expreſſeth: How in the 14. yeare of the Gothicke war, which is the 23. of *Iuſtinian*; when *Totilas* and the Gothes began to win againe divers parts of *Italy*, which *Beliſarius* had before recovered, *Vigilius* and divers *Italians* and *Romanes*, who were then at *Conſtantinople*, *ſubmiſſius & enixius poſtulabant ab Imperatore*, did in very ſubmiſſe and earneſt manner entreat the Emperour, that he would reduce all *Italy* into his ſubjection. Now it is very likely that together with this petition they ſignified divers matters to the Emperour, which were behoove-

y *Vict. in Chron. an. 16. (corrupte legitur 17.) poſt Coſſ. Baſilij.*

z *Bar. an. 554. nu. 6. & Bin. Not. in Conc. 5. §. Proſtitit.*

a *Proc. lib. 3. de Bell. Goth. pa. 193.*

full

full for his government in the Westerne parts: and this the Emperors answer then made unto them imports; who, as *Procopius* addeth, answered them, *Italiam sibi curæ fore, that hee would have a care of Italy:* but for that time hee was busie in composing the differences about Christian doctrines. The fift Synod then being ended, and all those Ecclesiasticall affaires concluded, nor that onely, but *Totilas* and *Teias* being both vanquished, and so the whole dominion of Italy being recovered by the victorious *Narses*, the Emperour in his 28. yeare, which was next after the Synod, performed that promise which hee had made before to *Vigilius* and the other Italians, and according to their request disposed and ordered divers matters which in that sanction are set downe.

29. Now if the words of the Sanction have respect (as I verily thinke they have) to that time, then all that *Baronius* collecteth from granting that sanction, and those priviledges upon the petition of *Vigilius* after his returne from exile, or after the Synod, are meere fancies and dreames. Or if it were admitted (whereof I can find no proofe at all) that *Vigilius* made, and the Emperour granted unto him this petition after the end of the Councell, yet will it not hence follow that *Vigilius* then consented to the Synod; for as wee have before declared, the Emperour was not so eager, nor rigorous against *Vigilius*, but that upon his entreaty hee might grant to establish those Lawes, which being in themselves so commodious and behoovefull, he without any entreaty, upon the consideration of those matters, would in all likelihood have enacted. And so every joynt of the Cardinalls second reason (wherein consists the very pith of his cause) drawne from the fact of *Iustinian*, in restoring him from exile, and dismissing him home with gifts and priviledges, being now fully dissolved by that which hath beene said, it remaineth cleere, that notwithstanding all which the Cardinall hath yet brought, there appeares no proofe nor token that *Vigilius* any time after the end of the Councell, either by his publike decree, as the Cardinall boasteth, or so much as by his personall profession, consented to the Synod, and the condemning of the *Three Chapters*.

30. His third [b] and last reason is drawne from those darke words of *Liberatus* [c], where he saith, *that Vigilius dyed, being afflicted by that heresie (of the Eutycheans) but he was not crowned.* Before wee examine the Cardinalls reason grounded hereon, let us first in a word observe the Cardinalls honest dealing with *Liberatus*. In that very same chapter, and in the words next before that sentence which the Cardinall alledgeth, *Liberatus* sets downe the Epistle and profession of *Vigilius*, wherein he defendeth the *Eutychean* heresie, and anathematizeth all who hold two natures in Christ as the Councell of *Chalcedon* had defined. Of that Epistle *Liberatus* witnesseth that it is the Epistle of *Vigilius*, and was truly written by him. *Baronius* seeing that to tend to the disgrace of *Vigilius*, that the Pope should be an heretike, an Eutychean, and should accurse all that are not such, what saith he for this matter? Truly he contemnes and rejects the testimonie of *Liberatus*; *The Epistle* [d] *is not the writing of Vigilius, it is an Impostor, a forged writing;*

[b] Bar. an. 554. nu. 5.
[c] Liber. ca. 22.
[d] Bar. an. 538. nu. 15.

ting, a counterfeit: notwithstanding all that *Liberatus* saith: So if *Liberatus* say ought distastfull to the Cardinals palate, *Liberatus* is a witnesse of no worth, he is utterly to be contemned, to be rejected. But if in the next words *Liberatus* say ought that seemeth to favour the Cardinalls fancy, *Liberatus* then is a worthy witnesse, you may not take any exception against *Liberatus*, if he say that *Vigilius*, when hee dyed, had consented to the fift Synod, you must beleeve him. Some would thinke this to be scarce currant dealing with his own witnesse, to make him sometimes more then a thousand, sometimes lesse then a Cypher, but such are almost all the Cardinalls witnesses, they speak not so much for him in one place, as they doe against him in others, nor is he so willing to accept them in one, as he is ready to reject thē in another. If *Liberatus* be to bee credited, why doth the Cardinall reject him? If he be not to be credited, why doth the Cardinall alleage him?

31. Thus one might if he listed, elude his proofe, and make a little sport with the Cardinalls Counters. But I will let the words of *Liberatus* stand in their best value; and to see the Cardinals deduction the better, wee must consider the whole sentence of *Liberatus*, which is this; *Vigilius* writing these things (to wit, that *hereticall Epistle*, in defence of *Eutycheanisme*) and that closely, to heretikes, continued sitting, (in the See of *Rome*) In whom was fulfilled that testimony of *Salomon, they shall eate the fruit of their owne way*, and they shall bee filled with their owne Counsells. *Ab ipsa hæresi afflictus* Vigilius, *nec coronatus, qualem vitæ terminum susceperit, notum est omnibus: Vigilius being afflicted by that heresie, but not crowned, how hee ended his life, every man can tell.* Thus *Liberatus*. In which words as you see, there is no mention at all either of *Vigilius* his going into banishment, or returning out of banishment, or of his defending the *three Chapters*, or of his condemning the same Chapters, or of the Emperours either casting him into, or releasing him from exile, or of the fift Councell, or of the end thereof; and yet out of these words will *Baronius* like a very skilfull Chymick extract, both that *Vigilius* after the end of the fift Councell was banished for defending the *Three Chapters*, and after that banishment, consented to the Synod, and to condemne the *three Chapters*. And see I pray you how the Chymick distills this. If *Liberatus*, saith he[e], being one of those who fought for the *Three Chapters*, had found *Vigilius, perstantem in sententia usque ad mortem, persisting untill his death in that sentence*, which in his *Constitution* he had published for defence of the *Three Chapters*, truly he would have praised *Vigilius* for a Martyr, had he dyed in such sort. But when he saith, *Vigilius* was afflicted, and not crowned, *planè alludit ad ejus exilium, he doth plainly allude to the banishment of* Vigilius, and to his forsaking or revolt from that judgement after he came from banishment. Thus doth the Cardinall glosse upon the words of *Liberatus*.

e Bar. an. 554. nu. 5.

32. See the force of truth; The Cardinalls owne words doe most fully answer his owne doubt, and explane that truth which hee wittingly oppugneth: Had *Liberatus* found *Vigilius, perstantem in sententia usque ad mortem, constant, or persisting without any change or relenting*

in

in his defending the three Chapters, untill his dying day, then indeed *Vigilius* ſhould have beene with *Liberatus* (an obſtinate defender of that ſentence) a glorious Martyr, at the leaſt a worthy Confeſſor, and for that cauſe he ſhould have beene condemned by *Liberatus*. But ſeeing he found him a changeling in his ſentence, wavering and unconſtant therein, turning his note as ſoone almoſt as he had looked the Emperour in the face, *Vigilius* by reaſon of that change, unconſtancie, and revolt from his opinion, loſt his Crowne, and all his commendation with *Liberatus*, not for any returning to condemne the *Three Chapters* after his exile, whereof in *Liberatus* there is no ſound nor ſyllable. By publiſhing his *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution* in the time of the Councell for defence of thoſe Chapters, and by his dying in that opinion, *Liberatus* found *Vigilius*, *ſtantem & morientem*, but not *perſtantem in ea ſententia uſque ad mortem*; he found him ſtanding and dying, but hee could not poſſibly find him perſiſting conſtantly, not perſevering in that ſentence which firſt he had embraced; for whereas he ſaw and knew the Synodall Acts, to teſtifie that for five or ſix yeares together, hee not onely was of a contrary judgement, but did judicially, and definitively decree the contrary, and cenſure alſo ſuch as continued and perſevered in the defence of thoſe Chapters; this ſo long diſcontinuance, and ſo earneſt oppugning of the defenders of thoſe Chapters, quite interrupted his perſiſting and perſevering in his firſt ſentence, for this cauſe he loſt his Crowne, and dyed *non coronatus*, in the Kalender, and account of *Liberatus*.

33. I adde further, that the words of *Liberatus* being well pondered, doe ſhew the quite contrary to that which the Cardinall thence collecteth. *Liberatus* as all the defenders of thoſe Chapters, held their oppoſites who condemned the ſame Chapters, for no other then heretikes, then oppugners of the Catholike faith, and holy Councell of *Chalcedon*. And for *Vigilius*, while hee fought [f] on their ſide, and againſt the Emperour, they honoured [g] him as a Catholike, as a chiefe defender of the Catholike faith. As ſoone as *Vigilius* had conſented to the Emperor, and upon his comming to *Conſtantinople* had condemned the *Three Chapters*, then they held him for no other then a betraier [h] of the faith, then an heretike, then a backſlider, revolter, and lapſer from the faith, and for ſuch they adjudged, and accurſed him by name in their Africane [i] Synod, at which it is moſt like that *Liberatus*, being a man of ſuch note for dealing in that cauſe, was preſent; upon his returning at the time of the fift Councell to defend againe with them the *Three Chapters*, they eſteemed him as one of thoſe *pœnitentes*, which after their lapſing returne againe to the profeſſion of the faith. Had *Vigilius* after this revolted, and turned againe to condemne the ſame Chapters, and in that opinion dyed, as out of *Liberatus*, the Cardinall would perſwade, *Liberatus* and the reſt of that ſect would have held him for a double heretike, for a lapſer, and relapſer from the faith, for one dying in hereſie, and dying a condemned heretike by the judgement of their Africane Synod. Now let any man judge whether *Liberatus* would have ſaid of ſuch an one as hee eſteemed an heretike, a condemned heretike, and to dye in hereſie, that hee dyed,

[f] *Complures Orthodoxi & ipſe Vigilius contra eadem Capitula aſſerta ab Imperatore inſurrexere.* Bar. an. 546. nu. 38.

[g] *Vigilius arguit ut prophanas vocum novitates. Facundi dictum apud* Bar. an. 546. nu. 57. 58.

[h] *Ne Traditor videretur. Facundi dictum de Vigilio apud* Bar. an. 547. nu. 37. *Colluſorem & Prævaricatorem conclamarunt.* Bar. an. eod. nu. 49. *vulgarunt ubiq; eum impugnare Concilium Chalcedonenſe.* Bar. an. 550. nu. 1.

[i] *Vict. in Chron. an. 9. poſt Conſ. Baſil.*

non

non coronatus? would he have minced and extenuated the crime of hereſie, of one dying in hereſie, would he not much rather have ſaid, he dyed *Damnatus*, *condemned*, and accurſed by the judgement of their owne Synod, and therefore utterly ſeparated from God? Who ever read or heard, that one dying in hereſie, was called by ſo friendly a title as *Non coronatus*?

43. This will moſt clearly appeare, if we conſider that the Church and Eccleſiaſticall Writers doe mention as two ſorts, ſo alſo two rewards of Catholike and Orthodoxall profeſſors. The one is of thoſe who are couragious and conſtant in defending the faith, ſuch as joyfully endure torments, impriſonment, exile, and if need be, even death it ſelfe rather then they will renounce and forſake the faith, and theſe are called *coronati*. The other is of thoſe who being timerous, and faint-hearted, yeeld to deny the truth, rather then they will endure torments or death for confeſſing the ſame; and yet by reaſon of that immortall ſeed which is in their hearts, they returne againe, and openly profeſſe that truth from which they had before lapſed: and theſe are called, *Non coronati*, ſaved by repentance, and returning to the truth; but by reaſon of their former faintneſſe, and lapſing, Not crowned. Both of theſe are Orthodoxall, and Catholikes, both of them placed in the bleſſed houſe of God, but not both in like bleſſed manſions and chambers of the houſe of God: *For in my Fathers* [k] *houſe are many manſions*. Both of them ſtarres, and glorious ſtarres in heaven, but even among thoſe heavenly ſtarres, *one ſtarre* [l] *differeth from another in glory*. Both of them receive an infinity of glory, but in that infinitie, the weight is unequall, and the one receives but as the pennie, the other as the pound or talent of that glory. Both of them bleſſed in the Kingdome of God, but the former not bleſſed onely, but crowned with bleſſednеſſe, the later bleſſed, but not crowned; neither with the Aureall Crowne of Martyrs, nor with the Lawrell garland of Confeſſors, yet ſtill, whether *coronati*, or *non coronati*, as they both dye in the profeſſion of the Catholike faith, ſo are they both rewarded with eternall glory for profeſſion of the Catholike faith. As for heretikes ſuch as die in hereſie, and out of the Catholike faith, they are to be ſorted with neither of theſe, they have another and a quite different ranke, *Claſſis* or *Predicament* of their owne. They may not have that honour done unto them, as to be called *non coronati*, which implies that they have a part in felicity, but not the Crowne. As the Church doth juſtly anathematize and accurſe ſuch, ſo are they to be ranked in the order of thoſe to whom Chriſt ſhall ſay, [m] *Goe yee curſed*. The Apoſtle [n] reckoning hereſies with Idolatry, witchcraft, adultery, and the like, of which he ſaith, *that they which doe them ſhall not inherite the Kingdome of God*.

k *Joan* 14. 2.
l 1 *Cor.* 15. 41.
m *Mat.* 25. 41.
n *Gal.* 5. 19, 20.

35. Hence now it doth clearly appeare, that *Liberatus* in ſaying that *Vigilius* dyed *Non coronatus*, cannot intend as the Cardinall moſt ignorantly collecteth, that *Vigilius* returned from the defence of the *three Chapters* to condemne the ſame; for that being in *Liberatus* judgment a revolt from the truth, hee thereby had by *Liberatus* beene accounted an heretike, and to dye in hereſie, and ſo had beene in the ranke

ranke of those who are *Damnati*; but *Liberatus*, in saying he dyed *non coronatus*, doth directly teach, that he dyed in defence of those *Three Chapters*, (which, with *Liberatus*, is the Catholike faith) from which hee had lapsed, and revolted before; but seeing at the time of the Councell, hee returned againe to that opinion, and therein dyed; hee was saved, (in *Liberatus* judgement) but not crowned: By his penitence, and returning to the defence of those Chapters, he got glory, but because he had so grievously lapsed before, hee lost the crowne of glory. And this also is the reason why *Victor*, Bishop of *Tunen* mentioneth the death of *Vigilius* in such a naked [o] manner, neither disgracing him as a Prevaricator, as hee doth *Firmus* [p], *Primasius* [q], and *Pelagius* [r]; nor honouring him as a Martyr or Confessor, as he doth *Fælix*, *Rusticus*, and *Reparatus* [s]; intimating thereby, that *Vigilius* dyed in the confession and defence of the *Three Chapters*, and therefore hee could not condemne him; but yet because he was not constant in that profession, he would not commend him.

36. Yea, but *Liberatus* by saying he was afflicted by that heresie, [t] *plane alludit ad ejus exilium, he doth plainly allude to the banishment of* Vigilius. Plainly? Phy on such a Plain-lie out of a Cardinals mouth; he doth not so much as obscurely, not under a cloud or mist, not any way allude unto it, nor intimate or insinuate ought tending thereunto; nor could hee indeed, seeing, as we have before declared, that banishment of *Vigilius* is nothing else but a fiction, partly of *Anastasius*, partly of *Baronius*; and *Liberatus* was no Prophet, that hee could allude to their idle dreams: But if he allude not to his banishment, why then saith he that *Vigilius* was afflicted by that heresie? as if there were no afflictions in the world but banishment; what ere hee meant, he meant not that: And truly, whatsoever calamities or afflictions, either of body or minde, befell *Vigilius* after he had once consented to the Emperors Edict, & to the condemning of the *Three Chapters*, (which, in *Liberatus* account, was heresie) and because it was (as hee thought) contrary to the Councell of *Chalcedon*, even the heresie of the *Eutycheans*; all those did *Liberatus* impute to that his revolt from the faith, and to that *Eutychean* heresie which he then embraced, as *Liberatus* judged. Now there are two or three evident matters, which were great afflictions to *Vigilius*, and may well bee intended by *Liberatus*.

37. The first was the generall dislike which the Italian, Africane, and other Westerne Bishops took against him, as soone as they knew that he had consented to the Emperours Edict, they writ against him, as one who denyed the faith, and condemned the Councell of *Chalcedon*, they censured, judged, and accursed him by their Synodall sentence; they contemned him as a temporizer; as one, who, to please the Emperour, betrayed the faith: This was, no doubt, no small affliction to *Vigilius*, to bee disgraced, contemned, and accursed by his owne friends, to whom, by so many bands of duty and love, he was so nearly conjoyned; and this lay upon his stomacke for five or sixe yeares together, even from his first comming almost, to *Constantinople*, to the time of the Councell.

38. His second affliction followed upon his change in the time of the

[o] *Vigilius Romanus in insula Sicilia moritur. Vict. in Chron. an. 16. post Cons. Bas.*

[p] *Firmus dotis Principis corruptus, assensum præbuit, sed in navi morte turpissima periit. Vict. ibid. an. 11. post Cons. Bas.*

[q] *Primasius à Catholicis, pro prævaricatore condemnatus infelici morte extinguitur. lib. 2. A prævaricatoribus ordinatur. Ibid. an. 17. post Cons. Bas.*

[r] *Reparatus exilio apud Euchaidam, gloriosa confessione transit ad dominum Vict. an. 22. post Cons. Bas.*

[s] *Bar. an. 554. nu. 5.*

[t] *Bar. an. 554. nu. 5.*

the Councell; for though hee then, by defending the *Three Chapters*, and publiſhing his *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution* for defence of them, hoped to recover the love and good opinion of the Weſterne Churches; yet hee exceedingly failed of that hope. Now hee was in farre worſe caſe than before; On one ſide he incurred the Emperours juſt indignation, and made himſelfe obnoxious to deprivation, baniſhment, death, or whatſoever puniſhments may bee inflicted on pertinacious, and hereticall oppugners of the faith; which, although the Emperour in his lenity did not, nor would inflict upon him; yet what a griefe is it to have all thoſe puniſhments hanging, like *Damocles* ſword, over his head, and ſure to fall upon him, if the Emperour at any time liſted to breake or cut the haire? What comfort could he have, who held not onely his dignitie, but his liberty, yea, his very life at the will and pleaſure of another? On another ſide he had incurred the heavie and juſt cenſure of the holy generall Councell, and of all Catholikes, being by them adjudged and accurſed for an heretike. On a third ſide the Weſterne Churches, and the defenders of the *Three Chapters*, were ſo farre from honouring him as he expected, that they alſo, for all that, held him for no other than an unconſtant and wavering perſon, one that turned his faith with every winde and weather: So, whereas at the firſt hee was beloved and honoured of the Weſterne Churches, while hee defended the *Three Chapters*, as they did; and after that was beloved and honoured of the Emperour, and Eaſterne Churches, while hee, with them, condemned the *Three Chapters*: when now againe he returned to defend them, hee was contemned both of the one ſort and the other; they all now eſteemed no better of him than a very Wethercocke. Now whether this, to ſee himſelfe forſaken and contemned by all, both friends and foes, both Catholikes and heretikes; whether this might not bee a corraſive to his heart, let any man duly conſider with himſelfe. Adde to theſe that corporeall anguiſh which cauſed his death; hee, if wee may truſt *Anaſtaſius*,[u] *afflictus, calculi dolorem habens, mortuus eſt, being afflicted and vexed with paine of the ſtone*, or (as by *Liberatus* it may bee thought) *by ſome more grievous diſeaſe of his body, dyed in great affliction*: When there were ſo many afflictions lying at the heart of *Vigilius*, all which *Liberatus* imputeth to his conſenting to the Emperours Edict, and condemning of the *Three Chapters*, which he, as the reſt of the defenders of them, called hereſie; was not the Cardinall, thinke you, in ſome extaſie of his wit, when he thought, that the affliction of *Vigilius* muſt needs bee his owne fictitious baniſhment, and that *Liberatus* doth plainly allude therunto.

u *Anaſt. in vit. Vig.*

39. Thus all the reaſons of *Baronius* being manie wayes, and manifeſtly declared to bee ineffectuall, to prove that laſt and Baronian change in *Vigilius*, after the end of the Synod, we may now ſafely conclude, that as *Vigilius*, after his *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution* in defence of the *Three Chapters* once publiſhed, made at no time after that, any publike, judiciall or Pontificall Decree to reverſe and adnul the ſame; but that ſtill ſtood in full power and ſtrength untill the death of *Vigilius*; ſo neither did hee ever after that time declare ſo much as a pri-

vate diſlike thereof, or a perſonall conſent to the fift Councell, which had decreed the contrary; but pertinaciouſly perſiſting in that ſentence, he both lived and dyed an hereticall defender of thoſe *Three Chapters*. At the firſt he was hereticall in defending them againſt the Emperours Edict: at the laſt he was not onely hereticall, but a condemned heretike in defending them againſt the judiciall ſentence of the holy generall Councell. In the middle time he had a fit of profeſſing the truth, but that was only in ſhew, and in appearance, that ſo he might temporize with the Emperour, in heart hee was (as when the time of tryall came he demonſtrated himſelfe) an oppugner of the truth, both againſt the Imperiall Edict, and Synodall judgement: And therefore, as wee found him at the firſt an heretike; ſo, for all which *Baronius* hath ſaid, or could ſay to the contrary, we muſt leave him for a condemned heretike; even ſuch a one, as not only defended, but, by his *Cathedrall* and *Apoſtolicall* ſentence, defined hereſie to be the Catholike faith. And thus much bee ſpoken of the Cardinals third principall Exception, or troupe of evaſions, marching under that Act of *Vigilius*, which, by his manifold changing in this cauſe of faith, you have fully ſeene.

Cap. XVIII.

The fourth and laſt Exception of Baronius, *in defence of* Vigilius, *pretending*, that the fift Councell (wherein the decree of *Vigilius* was condemned,) was neither a generall nor a lawfull Councell, till *Vigilius* confirmed the ſame, refuted.

1. HEre now remaineth onely the fourth and laſt exception of *Baronius*; in which, though being the weakeſt and worſt of all, his whole hope now conſiſts: In this the Cardinall brings forth all his forces, all the Engines of his wit and malice, to batter downe the authority of the fift generall Councell. Seeing it contradicted the Pope, and *judicially* decreed his *Apoſtolicall* ſentence to be hereticall, it ſhall bee of no authority at all; it ſhall bee neither a generall, nor a lawfull Councell; it ſhall bee nothing but a Conſpiracy and conventicle with *Baronius* and his friends, untill *Vigilius* doe approve the ſame: But heare their owne words to this purpoſe.

2. The fift Councell, ſaith *Baronius* [a], *aliquando expers fuit omnis authoritatis, was for a time void of all authority*; yea, ſo void thereof, *ut nec legitima Synodus dici meruerit, that it deſerved not to bee called ſo much as a lawfull* (much leſſe a generall and lawfull) *Synod*; becauſe it was aſſembled, the Pope reſiſting it, & was ended, the Pope contradicting it: But when afterwards it was approved by the ſentence of *Vigilius*, and other ſucceeding Popes, then it got the title and authority of an *Oecumenicall* Synod. Againe [b], *The fift Councell at that time, when it was held*,

a *An.* 593. *nu.* 124.

b *An. eod. nu.* 29.

held, could not have the name of an Oecumenicall Synod, ſeeing it was not lawfully aſſembled in the Holy Ghoſt, becauſe the Pope, neither by himſelfe, nor by his Legates would be preſent in it. And yet more ſpightfully; Theſe things [c] cõſidered, *planè conſenties, ipſam nec Oecumenicæ, nec privatæ Synodi mereri nomen; you will conſent, that the fift Councell deſerved not the name of an Oecumenicall, no nor ſo much as of a private Synod; it was no Synod nor Councell at all, ſeeing, both it was aſſembled, reſiſtente Pontifice, the Pope reſiſting it, and alſo pronounced ſentence, contra ipſius Decretum, againſt the Popes Decree.* Thus *Baronius*: in whoſe ſteps *Binius* treadeth, ſaying [d], *Pope* Vigilius *was not preſent in this Councell, either by himſelfe, or by his deputies, Contradixit eidem, he contradicted the Synod; the members aſſembled without the head, dum ageretur non conſentit, the Pope conſented not to it while it was held, nor did approve it ſtraight after it was ended; yet it got the name, title, and authority of an Oecumenicall Councell, quando ipſius* Vigilii *ſententia, when it was afterwards approved by the ſentence of* Vigilius *himſelfe, and his ſucceſſors.* So *Binius*.

c *An. eod. nu. 219*

d *Not. in Conc. 5. § Præſedit.*

3 How, or where ſhall I begin? or who, though more cenſorious than *Cato*, can with ſufficient gravity and ſeverity caſtigate the inſolency and moſt ſhameleſſe dealing of theſe men, who, rather than one of their Popes, even Pope *Proteus* himſelfe, ſhall bee thought to erre in his *Cathedrall Decree* of faith, care not to diſgrace, to vilifie, yea, to nullifie one of the ancient and ſacred generall Councels, approved, as before [e] we have ſhewed, by the whole Catholike Church? For if this Councell was neither generall, nor lawfull, (as they teach) till *Vigilius* approved it by his *Apoſtolicall* authority, after his returne from exile; then was it never, nor as yet is either a generall or lawfull Councell, ſeeing *Vigilius*, after his exile, never did, nor could approve it, as before [f] we have clearly proved: So this fift Councell muſt for ever be caſhiered and blotted out of the ranke of Councels. And becauſe, as their ſecond Nicene Synod rightly diſputes [g], the ſeventh muſt follow the ſixt, in the ſame ranke and order, and the ſixt, the fift, if there was no fift generall and holy Councell; neither can there bee any ſixt, nor ſeventh, nor eighth, nor any other after it. So, by the aſſertion of theſe men, there are at once daſhed out fourteene of thoſe, which themſelves [h] doe honour by the name of holy generall Councels.

e *Sup. ca. 4. nu. 26. at ſeq.*

f *Sup. ca. 17.*

g *Omne ſeptimũ ordinatum in eãdem numeratione quã res præceſſerunt, &c. Act. 6. pa. 357. a.*

h *Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 5.*

4. I ſay more, the expunging of all thoſe fourteene Councels, doth certainly follow upon the Cardinals aſſertion, though it were granted, that *Vigilius* had confirmed this fift, as it is true, that *Pelagius* and *Gregory* did: For if it was (as he teacheth) neither a generall nor lawfull Synod, while the Councell continued, and for that whole time while it was an aſſembly of Biſhops; then undoubtedly it never at any time was; nor yet is either a generall or a lawfull Synod: For after the end, and diſſolution thereof, it was never extant *in rerum natura* againe; it was ever after that time *Non ens*: and being neither Synod, nor yet ſo much as *Ens*, it could not poſſibly be either generall or lawfull. It is a Maxime, *Non entis non ſunt Accidentia*; If while it was extant, and while it was an aſſembly, it was but a conventicle; if then it was not gathered in Gods name, I pray you, when was

it ever after that, gathered in Gods name? Did *Vigilius*, *Pelagius*, or *Gregory*, when they made it, by their approbation, a generall and lawfull Councell; did they, like some new *Æolus*, blow all the Bishops againe to *Constantinople*, and assemble them the second time in the Popes name, that so they might be said to be gathered in Gods name? Let their Popes trie, if by all their magicall skill, or omnipotent power, they can make any one of those *Africane* Councels under *Cyprian*, a Generall; or make the *Arimine*, *Syrmian*, or second *Ephesine*, a lawfull Councell, and I will instantly yeeld, that hee may doe the like to this fift. If hee cannot doe any of the former, what vanitie was it in the Cardinall and *Binius* to say of this fift, that while it was extant, and *Ens*, it was neither a general nor lawful Councel; but some one, or some twenty yeares after, when it was *non Ens*, the Pope made it, with a word, both a generall and lawfull Councell? *Dixit & factum est:* One word of his mouth makes, or unmakes what he list: Truth is, the Popes, or any other Bishops approbation, or confirmation of a Councell, or any decree thereof, after the Councell is once ended, may perhaps in the opinion of some men, gaine some more liking unto that Councell, or decree, than before it had, seeing now it hath the expresse consent of those Bishops, whom the other doe much esteeme: but the after consent, or approbation of all the Bishops in the world, much lesse of the Pope, cannot make that to bee a generall, which before, and while it was extant, was onely Provinciall; or that to be a lawfull, which before, and while it was extant, was an unlawfull Synod: Even as the Pope, and a thousand Bishops with him, cannot now make any of the foure first generall and holy Councels, to be either unlawfull or particular Synods; and yet his power is every whit as great in annihilating that which now is, as in creating that which never was a generall or a lawfull Councell.

5. Say you that the fift Councell was of no authority till the Pope approved it, and unlesse he should approve it? See how contrary the Cardinals assertion is to the consenting judgement of the whole Church. Begin we with the Church of that age: *Baronius* tels us, *that both the Emperour, the Pope, Mennas, and other Easterne Bishops, agreed to referre the deciding of this doubt about the Three Chapters, to a generall Councell.* Why did none of them reason, as the Cardinall now doth, against the Councell? Why did the Pope delude them with that pretence of a generall Councel? Why did hee not deale plainly with the Emperour and the rest, who made that agreement, and say to this effect unto them? Why will yee referre this cause to the judgment of a Councell, it cannot decide this question otherwise than my selfe shall please? If they say as I say, it shall be a Councell, a lawfull, a generall, an holy Councell: If they say the contrary to that which I affirme, though they have ten thousand millions of voyces, their Decree shall be utterly void, their assembly unlawfull, they shall neither bee, nor bee called a generall, nor a lawfull Councell, no nor a Councell neither, but onely a Conventicle, without all authoritie in the world. Had the Emperour and the Church beleeved this doctrine, there had beene no fift Councell ever called or assembled; nay, there

1 *An.* 547. *nu.* 41. & 43.

there never had beene any other holy generall Councell: The Pope had beene in ſtead of all, and above them all. This very act then of referring the judgement in this cauſe to a generall Councell, witneſſeth them all (even the Pope himſelfe at that time) to have eſteemed the ſentence of the Synod to be of authority without the Popes conſent, and to be of more authority, in caſe they ſhould differ (as in this queſtion they did) than the ſentence of the Pope. This before the Councell was aſſembled.

6. At the time of the Councell, had the Church or holy Synod which repreſented the whole Church, beleeved their aſſembly without the Pope to be no Synod, but a Conventicle; why did they at all come together after their ſecond Seſſion? for they were then aſſured by the Pope himſelfe, that he would neither come, nor ſend any deputies unto them. Or had they beleeved that his definitive ſentence would or ought to have overſwayed others, ſo that without his aſſent their judgement ſhould be of no validity, why did they after the fift Seſſion, once proceed to examine or determine that cauſe? For before the ſixt day of their aſſembling, they received from Pope *Vigilius* his Cathedrall and *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution* in that cauſe, inhibiting them either to write or ſpeak (much more judicially to define) ought contrarie to his ſentence: or if they did, that he by his authority had beforehand refuted and condemned the ſame. Seeing notwithſtanding all this well knowne unto them, they not onely continued their Synodall aſſemblies, but judicially defined that cauſe, and that quite contrary to the Popes judgement made knowne unto them; it is an evident demonſtration, that the whole general Councell judged their aſſemblies both lawfull and Synodall, and their ſentence of full authority, even as ample as of any generall Councell, though the Pope denied his preſence to the one, and expreſſely ſignified not onely his diſlike, but contradiction and condemnation of the other.

7. What can pervicacie it ſelfe oppoſe to ſo cleare an evidence? or what thinke you will the Cardinall or his friends reply hereunto? Will he, or can he ſay, that theſe men who thus judged, were heretikes? They were not. The doctrine which they maintained was wholly Catholike, *conſonant* (as they [k] profeſſe, and as in truth it was) *to Scriptures, to Fathers, to the foure former generall Councells.* The doctrine which they oppugned, and *Vigilius* then defended, was hereticall, condemned by all the former, Scriptures, Fathers, and Councels. Heretikes then doubtleſs they could not be; that, like a leproſie did cleave to *Vigilius*. Will he, or can he ſay that they were Schiſmatikes? Neither is that true. For they all even then remained in the communion with the Catholike Church: yea they were by repreſentation the true Catholike Church: I ſay further, they held communion even with Pope *Vigilius* himſelfe, till his owne pertinacy, and wilfull obſtinacie againſt the true faith, ſevered him both from them, & from the truth. In token of which communion with *Vigilius*, they earneſtly [l] entreated his preſence in the Synod, they offered him the preſidency therein, yea they ſaid in expreſſe words unto him, before they knew his mind to defend the *Three Chapters*, *Nos* [m] *vero & communicamus & uniti vobiſcum*

[k] *Coll.* 8.

[l] *Sup. cap.* 2. *num.* 1. *& ſeq.*

[m] *Coll.* 2. *p.* 523.

biſcum ſumus, We all doe hold communion with you, and are united unto you. Schiſmaticall then they could not be. So the judgement of theſe men being all Catholikes, and holding the Catholike communion, doth evidently prove the whole Catholike Church at that time, to have beleeved a Councell to be both generall and lawfull, though the Pope diſſented from it, and by his *Apoſtolicall* authority condemned the ſame, and the decree thereof.

8. After the end of the Councell did the Church then think otherwiſe? Did it then judge the Councell to want authority, while it wanted the Popes approbation, or to receive authority by his approbation? Who were they, I pray you, that thought thus? Certainly not Catholikes, and the condemners of theſe Chapters. For they approved the Councel and *Decree* thereof during the time of the Councell, and while the Pope ſo far diſliked it, that for his refuſall to conſent unto it, he endured baniſhment. Neither did the Heretikes who defended thoſe Chapters, judge thus. For they, as *Baronius* witneſſeth [n], *perſiſted in the defence of them, and in a rent from the others, even after Vigilius had conſented to the Synod:* yea among them *Vigilius* [o] *redditus eſt execrabilis, was even deteſted and accurſed by them for approving the Synod.* Or becauſe *Vigilius* approved it not, *Pelagius* who is knowne to have approved it, was ſo generally diſliked for that cauſe of the Weſterne Biſhops, *that there* [p] *could not be found three who would lay hands on him at his conſecration*; but in ſtead of a Biſhop, they were enforced againſt that Canon [q] of the Apoſtles, which they often oppoſe to us, to take a Preſbyter of *Oſtia* at his ordination. So much did they diſlike both the fift Councell, and all (though it were the Pope) who did approve it. Now the whole Church being at that time divided into theſe two parts, the defenders and condemners of thoſe Chapters, ſeeing neither the one nor the other judged the Synod to be generall or lawfull, becauſe the Pope approved it; who poſſibly could there be at that time of the Cardinals fancie, that the fift Councell wanted all authority till the Pope approved it, and gained authority of a generall and lawfull Councell by his approving of it? Catholikes and condemners of thoſe Chapters, embraced the Councell, though the Pope rejected it: Heretikes and defenders of thoſe Chapters, rejected the Councell, though the Pope approved it. Neither of them both (and ſo none at all in the whole Church) judged either the Popes approbation to give, or his reprobation to take away authority from a generall Councell. Thus by the *Antecedentia*, *Concomitantia*, and *Conſequentia* of the Councell, it is manifeſt by the judgement of the whole Church in that age, that this fift Councell was of authority without the Popes approbation, and was not held of authority by reaſon of his approbation.

9. What the judgement of the Church was, as well in the ages preceding, as ſucceeding to this Councell, is evident by that which we have already declared. For we have at large ſhewed [r], that the doctrine, faith, and judgement of this fift Councell, is conſonant to all former, and confirmed by all following generall Councells, till that at *Lateran* under *Leo* the tenth. Whereupon it enſueth, that this doctrine

[n] *An.* 553. *nu.* 221.

[o] *An.* 555. *nu.* 2.

[p] *Adeo exhorruiſſe viſi ſunt Antiſtites occidentales aliam poſt quartam admittere oecumenicam Synodum, ut non potuerit Pelagius reperire Epiſcopos Romæ à quibus conſecraretur.* Bar. an. 556. nu. 1.

[q] *Can.* 1. *& Con. Nic. can.* 4.

[r] *Sup. Lib.* 4. *nu.* 83, 86. *& ſeq.*

doctrine which wee maintaine, and the Cardinall impugneth, (that neither the Popes approbation doth give, nor his reprobation take away authority from a Councell,) was embraced and beleeved as a Catholike truth, by the whole Catholike Church of all ages, till that *Lateran* Synod, that is, for more than 1500. yeares together.

10. And if there were not so ample testimonies in this point, yet even reason would enforce to acknowledge this truth. For if this fift Councell be of force and Synodall authority, *eo nomine*, because the Pope, to wit *Pelagius*, approved it; then by the same reason is it of no force or Synodall authority, *eo nomine*, because the Pope, to wit *Vigilius*, rejected it. If the Popes definitive and *Apostolicall* reprobation cannot take away authority from it; neither can his approbation, though *Apostolicall*, give authority unto it. Or if they say that both are true, (as indeed they are both alike true) then seeing this fift Councell is both approved by Pope *Pelagius*, and rejected by Pope *Vigilius*, it must now be held both to be wholly approved, and wholly rejected: both to be lawfull, and unlawfull: both to be a generall Councell, and no generall Councell. And the very same doome must bee given of all the thirteene Councells which follow it: They all, because they are approved by some one Pope, are approved and lawfull Councels: and because they approve this fift, which is rejected by the Pope, they are all rejected, and unlawfull Councells. Such an havocke of generall Councels doth this their assertion bring with it, and into such inextricable labyrinths are they driven, by teaching the authority of Councels to depend on the Popes will and pleasure.

11. Now though this bee more than abundant to refute all that they can alledge against this fift Councell, yet for the more clearing of the truth, and expressing my love to this holy Councell, to which next after that at *Chalcedon*, I beare speciall affection; I will more strictly examine those two reasons which *Baronius* & *Binius* have used, of purpose to disgrace this holy Synod. The former is taken from the assembling; the later, from the decree of the Councell. It was assembled, say *Baronius* [f] and *Binius*, *Pontifice resistente & contradicente, the Pope resisting and contradicting it*. Whence they inferre, that it was an unlawfull assembly, not gathered in Gods name. In this their reason, both the antecedent and consequence are unsound and untrue. Did Pope *Vigilius* resist this Councell, and contradict the calling or assembling thereof? What testimonie doth *Baronius* or *Binius* bring of this their so confident assertion? Truly none at all. What probabilities yet, or conjectures? Even as many. Are not these men, think you, wise & worthy disputers, who dare avouch so doubtfull matters, and that also to the disgrace of an holy, ancient, and approved Councell; and yet bring no testimonie, no probabilitie, no conjecture, no proofe at all of their saying? *Ipse dixit*, is in stead of all.

[f] *Sup. hoc cap. nn. 2.*

12. But what will you say if *Ipse dixit* will prove the quite contrarie? If both *Baronius* and *Binius* professe, that *Vigilius* did consent that this Councell should be held? Heare I pray you their own words, and then admire and detest the most vile dealing of these men. *Hanc Synodum, Vigilius authoritate pontificia indixit*, saith *Binius* [g]; *Vigilius called*

[g] *Nat. in 5. Can. 5. Concilium.*

called and appointed this Synod by his papall authority. Againe [u], *The Emperour called this fift Synod, authoritate Vigilij, by the authority of Pope Vigilius.* Baronius sings the same note: *It was very well provided,* saith he [x], *that this Oecumenicall Synod should be held, ex Vigilii Papæ sententia, according to the minde and sentence of Pope Vigilius,* who above all other men desired to have a Councell. Againe [y], *The Emperour decreed that the Synod should be called, ex ipsius Vigilii sententia, according to the minde of Vigilius.* And a little after; It was commendable in the Emperor, that he did labour to assemble the Synod, *ex Vigilij Papæ sententia, according to the minde and sentence of Pope Vigilius.* Neither onely did the Pope consent to have a Councell, but to have it in that very city where it was held, and where himselfe then was. Indeed at the first, the Pope was desirous [z] and earnest, to have it held in Sicily, or in some Westerne Citie: (even as Pope *Leo* had laboured [a] with *Theodosius* for the Councell which was held at *Chalcedon:*) But when *Iustinian* the Emperour would not consent [b] to that petition, (as neither *Theodosius* nor *Martian* would to the former of *Leo,*) *Vigilius* then, *voluntati* [c] *Imperatoris libens accessit, very willingly consented to the Emperours pleasure in this matter,* that the Oecumenicall Councell should be held at *Constantinople.* Say now in sadnesse, what you thinke of *Baronius* and *Binius?* Whither had they sent their wits, when they laboured to perswade this Councell to be unlawfull, because Pope *Vigilius* resisted and contradicted the assembling thereof? whereas themselves so often, so evidently, so expresly testifie, not onely that it was assembled by the consent, and according to the minde, will, pleasure, desire, authority, and sentence of the Pope; but the very chiefe act and royaltie of the summons they challenge (though falsely) to the Pope; the other, which is an act of labour and service, to be as it were the Popes Sumner or Apparitor, in bringing the Bishops together by the Popes authoritie, that, and none but that they allow to the Emperour.

13. Many other testimonies might bee produced, to declare this truth: That of *Sigonius* [d]: The Emperour called this Synod, *Vigilio Pontifice permittente, Pope Vigilius permitting him:* that of *Wernerus* [e]; *Vigilius jussit Concilium Constantinopoli celebrari, Vigilius commanded that this Councell should be held at Constantinople:* That of *Zonaras* [f] and *Glicas* [g], who both affirme, that *Vigilius* was *Princeps Concilij, the chiefe Bishop of the Councell:* not chiefe among them that sate in the Councell, for there he was not at all: nor chiefe in making the Synodall decree, for therein he contradicted the Councell: but chiefe of all who sued to the Emperour, and procured the Councell, as being desirous of the same. But omitting the rest, the whole generall Councell, yea and the Popes owne letters, put this out of all doubt. This say [h] the whole Councell, even in their Synodall sentence, *Consensit in scriptis in Concilio convenire, Vigilius under his owne hand-writing consented to come together, and be present with us in the Synod.* Againe, the Legates sent from the Councell to invite *Vigilius,* said [i] thus unto him, Your Holinesse knoweth, *quod promisistis unà cum Episcopis convenire, that you have promised to come together with the other Bishops, into the Councell; and there to debate this question.* *Vigilius* himselfe writ [k] thus to the Bishops of the Councell:

u *Ibid.*

x *An.* 553. *nu.* 23

y *Ibid. nu.* 24.

z *Optavimus & frequentissime supplici voce poposcimus eundē (cœtum) ad quēlibet Italiæ locū, aut certe ad Siciliam, &c. Vigil. in Constit. apud Bar. an.* 553. *nu.* 56.

a *Epist. Leon.* 24

b *Quod quia fieri Serenitas vestra non annuit. Vigil. loc. cit.*

c *Bin. Not. in Conc.* 5. §. *Concilium.*

d *Lib.* 20. *an.* 553.

e *An.* 544.

f *An. to.* 3. *in Iustiniano.*

g *Cui Concilio præerant Eutychius, Domnus & Vigilius. Glic. annal. part.* 4. *pa.* 379.

h *Coll.* 8. *p.* 584. *a*

i *Coll.* 1. *pa.* 523.

k *Coll.* 1. *p.* 523. *b*

Councell: We knowing your desire, *praedictis postulationibus annuimus, have consented to your petitions*, that in an orderly assembly being made, wee may conferre with our united brethren about the three Chapters. I doubt not but upon such faire and undoubted records, every one will now confesse, First, that if to be gathered by the Popes consent and authority, will make a Councell lawfull, (which with them is an authentike rule) then this fift Councell is without question in this respect most lawfull: Secondly, that *Baronius* and *Binius* are shamelesse both in uttering untruths, & in reviling this holy Synod, which they would perswade to be unlawful, because it was assembled, the Pope resisting it; whereas this Councell to have beene assembled, with the consent (yea as they boast with the authority also) of Pope *Vigilius*, not onely other Writers, but the Synodall Acts, the whole generall Councell, the letters of *Vigilius*, and the expresse words of *Baronius* and *Binius* themselves doe evidently declare.

14. Come now to the Consequence. Say the Pope had resisted the assembling of this Councell, was it for this cause unlawfull, was it no generall Councell? What say you then to the second Councell, of which *Baronius* thus writeth [l], It was held, *repugnante Damaso, Pope Damasus resisting the holding thereof*. Will they blot that also out of the ranke of generall, and lawfull Synods? If not, why may not this fift also bee a generall and lawfull Synod, though *Vigilius* had with tooth and naile resisted the same? Shall the peevishnesse or perversnesse of the Pope, or any Bishop hinder the assembling of a generall Councell, and so the publike peace and tranquillity of the whole Church? Open but this gappe, and there never should have been, nor ever shall be any generall Councell. The wilfulnesse of *Eusebius* Bishop of *Nicomedia*, at *Nice*; of *Iohn* Patriarch of *Antioch*, at *Ephesus*; of *Dioscorus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, at *Chalcedon*, will frustrate all those holy Councells, and make them to be neither generall nor lawfull. The saying of Cardinall *Cusanus* is worthy observing to this purpose; *I beleeve*, saith he [m], *that to be spoken not absurdly, that the Emperor himselfe, in regard of that care and custody of preserving the faith, which is committed unto him, may præceptivè indicere Synodum, by his Imperiall authority and command assemble a Synod, when the great danger of the Church requireth the same; negligente aut contradicente Romano Pontifice, the Pope either neglecting so to doe, or resisting and contradicting the doing thereof*. So *Cusanus*. This was the very state and condition of the Church at this time, when the fift Councell was assembled. The [n] whole Church had beene a long time scandalized and troubled about those *Three Chapters*, it was rent and divided from East to West. High time it was and necessary for *Iustinian* to see that flame quenched, although Pope *Vigilius* or any other Patriarch had never so eagerly resisted the remedie thereof.

15. Had the Cardinall pleaded against this Synod, that *Vigilius* had not beene called unto it, hee had spoken indeed to the purpose. For this is essentiall, and such as without which a Synod cannot bee generall and lawfull, that all Bishops be summoned to the Synod, and comming thither, have free accesse unto it, and freedome of speech and

l *An.* 553. *nu.* 2.

m *Lib.* 3. *de Concor. ca.* 15.

n *Vid. sup. ca.* 1. *nu.* 6.

and judgment therein. But the Cardinall durſt not take this exception againſt this Synod, or for *Vigilius*; for none of theſe to have beene wanting in this Councell, is ſo cleare, that pertinacie it ſelfe cannot deny it. It was not the Pope (as they vainly boaſt) but the Emperor, who by his owne and Imperiall authority called this Councell, as the whole Synod even in their Synodall ſentence witneſſe: Wee are aſſembled here in this City, *juſſione piiſſimi Imperatoris vocati, being called by the commandement of our moſt religious Emperor*. His calling to have beene generall, *Nicephorus* doth expreſly declare, The Emperor ſaith he [o], aſſembled the fift generall Councell, *Epiſcopis eccleſiarum omnium evocatis, the Biſhops of all Churches being called unto it*: yea the Emperor was ſo equall in this cauſe, that *Binius* [p] teſtifieth of him, *Paris numeri Epiſcopos ex Oriente & Occidente convocavit, that he called* (in particular, and beſides his generall ſummons, by which all without exception had free acceſſe) *as many out of the Weſt, where the defenders of thoſe Chapters did abound; as he did out of the Eaſt, where the ſame Chapters were generally condemned*. And yet further, *Vigilius* himſelfe was by name, not onely invited, intreated, and by many reaſons perſwaded, but even commanded by the Emperor, and in his name, to come unto the Synod, as before [q] we ſhewed. Now what freedome hee might have had in the Councell, both that offer of the Preſidencie, doth ſhew for him in particular, and the words of the Councell ſpoken concerning all in generall doth declare; for when *Sabinianus* and others, who being then at *Conſtantinople*, were invited to the Synod, and refuſed to come, the ſynod ſayd [r], *It was meet that they being called ſhould have come to the Councell, and have been partakers of all things which are here done and debated*, eſpecially ſeeing both the moſt holy Emperour and we, *licentiam dedimus unicuiq; have granted free liberty to every one to manifeſt his minde in the Synod concerning the cauſes propoſed*. Seeing then he not onely might, but in his duty both to God, to the Emperour, and to the whole Church, hee ought to have come, and freely ſpoken his minde in this cauſe, his reſiſting the will of the Emperor, and refuſing to come, doth evidently demonſtrate his want of love to the truth, and dutifulneſſe to the Emperor, and the Church; but it can no way impaire or impeach the dignity and authority of the Councell, neither for the generality, nor for the lawfulneſſe thereof.

16. Beſides all which there is yet one thing above all the reſt to be remembred; for though Pope *Vigilius* was not preſent in the Synod either perſonally, or by his Legates, but in that ſort reſiſted to come unto it, yet he was preſent there by his letters of inſtruction, by his *Apoſtolicall* and *Cathedrall Conſtitution* which hee publiſhed as a direction what was to be judged and held in that cauſe of the *Three Chapters*, That Decree and Conſtitution he promiſed to ſend *ad Imperatorem & Synodum, both to the Emperor and to the Synod, quod & ingenuè præſtitit, which alſo he ingenuouſly performed as the Cardinall tells [s] us*. That elaborate [t] decree, to which an whole Synod, together with the Pope ſubſcribed, containing the Popes ſentence and inſtruction given in this cauſe, *Vniverſo [u] orbi Catholico cunctiſq; fidelibus*, not onely to the Synod

o *Lib. 17. ca. 27.*
p *Not. in Conc. 5. §. Concilium.*
q *Sup. ca. 2. nu. 1. & 3.*
r *Collat. 2. pa. 524. b.*
s *An. 553. nu. 47.*
t *Idq; elaboravit. ibid.*
u *An. eod. nu. 48.*

Synod, teaching them what they ſhould define, but to all Chriſtians, teaching them what they ſhold beleeve, was *in conſeſſu Epiſcoporum recitatum, read and recited before all the Biſhops in that Councell*, as *Binius* doth[x] aſſure us. This one kinde of preſence in the Synod, is ſuppletive of all the reſt, of more worth then 20. nay then 200. Legates, *à latere* ſent from his holineſſe. They all may deale beſides, or contrary to the Popes minde, as *Zacharias* and *Rhodoaldus* did in a Councell held about the cauſe of *Photius*; but this *Cathedrall* inſtruction is an inflexible meſſenger, no bribes, no perſwaſions, no feare, no favour can extort from it one ſyllable more then his holineſſe by the *infallible* direction of his Chaire hath delivered; yea though the Pope ſhould have beene perſonally preſent in the Synod, and face to face ſpoken his mind in his cauſe, yet could not his ſudden or leſſe premeditated ſpeech have beene for weight or authority comparable to this decree, being elaborated after ſeven yeares ponderation of the cauſe, and all things in it being diſpoſed *cum omni undiq; cautela atque diligentia, with all diligence and circumſpection*, that could poſſibly bee uſed, which the Pope though abſent in body, yet ſent as an Oracle from heaven to be a direction to the Synod, and to ſupply his own abſence. So many wayes is this former objection of *Baronius* vaine, and unſound, when he pretends this Councell to have beene unlawfull becauſe the Pope reſiſted it, and the members aſſembled without their head: for neither did *Vigilius* reſiſt their aſſembling, but freely and willingly conſented unto it; neither was hee excluded from the Synod, but moſt undutifully abſented himſelfe from it: and though the members at that time wanted the Popes head-peece, yet they had his heart, his minde, and his *Apoſtolicall* direction among them, to bee a Cynoſure unto them in that cauſe, which alone is able to ſupply both his perſonall and Legantine abſence in any Councel.

x *Not. in Conc. §. §. Conſtituit.*

17. The other objection of *Baronius* is taken from the decree of this Synod. The ſentence, ſaith he[y], given by it, was *contra ipſius decretum, againſt the decree of Vigilius*, and therefore their aſſembly deſerved not the name of a generall, no nor ſo much as of a private Synod, it was no Councell at all. Cardinall *Bellarmine* explaines this more fully, ſaying[z], *Such Councells as define matters againſt the Popes inſtruction; Reprobata Concilia dici debent, are to bee called or accounted, Rejected Councells; for it is all one, ſaith he, whether the Pope doe expreſly reject and reprobate a Councell, or whether the Councell deale, contra Pontificis ſententiam, againſt the Popes ſentence, either of both ſuch Councells, are reiected, and ſo of no authoritie at all.* So *Bellarmine*. What ſhall we anſwer to the perverſneſſe of theſe men? If this rule be admitted, the Church hath for ever and inevitably loſt this fift Councell, and (by their ſecond Nicen collection) the ſixt, the ſeventh, and all that follow. And I verily am perſwaded, that none can poſſibly excuſe either *Baronius*, or *Bellarmine* from this crime of expunging the fift Councell, and all which follow it, from the ranke and number of generall, or approved Councels. For it is as cleare as the ſunſhine at noone day, that the ſentence pronounced by the fift ſynod was contradictory to the definition and *Cathedrall* inſtruction ſent by Pope *Vigilius* unto them. If then

y *An. 553 nu. 219.*

z *Lib. 2. de Conc. ca. 11. §. Ac de.*

then to define a cauſe contrary to the Popes inſtruction be a ſure note of a Reprobate Councell, as they teach it to be; farewell for ever this fift, and all that follow it, or approve it: they are all by the rule of theſe two worthy Cardinals, Reprobated Councels, nay not ſo much as Councels, but meere Conſpiracies or Conventicles.

18. Beſides this, ſee I pray you the zeale and devotion of theſe men to the Catholike faith. If this Councell be for this cauſe a Rejected Councell, becauſe it followed not the inſtructions of Pope *Vigilius* ſent unto it, then it ſhould have beene an holy, and approved Councell, if it had followed thoſe inſtructions of *Vigilius*; that is, if it had condemned the Councells of *Nice*, *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*, if it had decreed *Neſtorianiſme* to be the Catholike faith, and Ieſus Chriſt not to be God: for *Vigilius* by decreeing that the *Three Chapters* ought to be defended, inſtructed them thus to define and judge. Had they thus done, then, becauſe they had followed the inſtructions of *Vigilius*, the two Cardinalls would have embraced this Councell, with both armes, have applauded, & advanced it to the skies: ſeeing it did not ſo, but contradicted the Popes *Apoſtolicall* inſtructions at this time; fie on it, it is an unlawfull, a Reprobated Councell, nay it is no Councell at all, nor of any authority. Can any with reaſon judge theſe men to be ought elſe then *Neſtorians*, then condemned heretikes, and obſtinate oppugners of all ancient holy Councells, and of the Catholike faith? See the ſtrange diverſity of judgement which is in us and them. They in their hereticall dotage on the Popes Cathedrall *infallibility*, teach this fift holy Councell to bee a reprobated ſynod, *eo nomine*, becauſe it followed not the inſtructions of Pope *Vigilius*; we on the contrary doe conſtantly affirme it to bee an holy and moſt approved ſynod, *eo nomine*, becauſe it followed not, but rejected and condemned thoſe *Cathedrall* inſtructions of *Vigilius*: with us conſent the ſixt, ſeventh, and all ſucceeding generall Councells, till that at *Laterane*, all former holy Councells alſo, to all which this Councell is conſonant. From them diſſent all theſe both former and ſubſequent Councells; that is, the whole Catholike Church for fifteene hundreth yeares and more. *Vtri creditis*? whoſe doctrine thinke you now is ancient, orthodoxall, and catholike? And whether had you rather with theſe two Cardinalls, account this fift ſynod an unlawfull aſſembly, and a reprobate Councell, becauſe it contradicted the hereticall conſtitution of Pope *Vigilius*, or with ſuch an army of witneſſes, honor it for a ſacred, Oecumenicall approved Councell, though it not onely wanted the approbation, but had in plaine words the *Cathedrall* Reprobation [z] of Pope *Vigilius*.

19. Having now fully refuted not onely the Aſſertion of *Baronius*, That this Councell was of no authority, nor an approved Councell till Pope *Vigilius* confirmed and approved it, but alſo both thoſe reaſons whereby he would perſwade the ſame: there remaineth yet one doubt, which neceſſarily is to be ſatisfied for the finall clearing of this point. For it will, and juſtly may bee demanded, what it was which made this fift an approved Councell? Or if it bee not the Popes confirmation and approbation, what it is in any Councell, or any decree thereof

[z] *Si quid contra hæc quæ ſtatuimus, à quolibet factum dictum atq; conſcriptum eſt, vel fuerit; hoc modis omnibus ex authoritate ſedis Apoſtolicæ refutamus. Conſt. Vig. in fine.*

thereof, which makes it to be, and rightly to be esteemed an approved Councell or Decree? I constantly answer, that whatsoever it be, it is no approbation, no confirmation, nor any act of the Pope; at least no more of him, than of any other Patriarke or Patriarchall Primate in the Church: An evident proofe whereof is in the second Generall Councell; for that, ever since their Synodall sentence was made against the MACEDONIANS, and ratified by the Emperour, was esteemed by the Catholike Church an Oecumenicall, and approved Councell, and that, before the Pope had consented unto it or approved the same: For that Councell being assembled in *May* [a], when *Eucherius* and *Seagrius* were Consuls, (*an.* 381.) continued till [b] about the end of *Iuly* in the same yeare. On the 30. of *Iuly Theodosius* the Emperour published his severe law against the *Macedonians*, being then condemned heretikes: Hee commanded that forth with al Churches should be giv̄e to those, who held the one and equall Majesty of the Father, Sonne, and Holy Ghost, and were of the same faith with *Nestorius*, *Timotheus*, and other Bishops in that Synod; but whosoever dissented in faith from them, *ut manifestos hæreticos ab Ecclesia expelli, they should all be expelled as manifest hæretikes, and never be admitted againe.* In which law seeing the *Macedonians* are called manifest heretikes, that is, such as are convicted and condemned by a generall Councell, it is doubtlesse, that at the promulgating of this law, both the Emperour and the catholike Church, held that decree of the second Councel, against the *Macedonians*, to be the judgment of an holy, lawful, & approved Oecumenical Synod, such as was the most ample convictiō of an heretike, & manifestation of a heresie. Now this Edict was published before Pope *Damasus* either approved that Councell, or so much as knew what was done therein: For the first newes what was done in the Councell, came to *Damasus*, after the Councell of *Aquileia*, as after *Sigonius* [d], *Baronius* declareth; who after the Synod at *Aquileia* described, saith [e], *Post hæc autem, After these things done at Aquileia*, when *Damasus* had received a message concerning the Councell at *Constantinople*, &c. that Councell at *Aquileia* was held [f] on the fift of *September*, when the other at *Constantinople* was ended a month before: and how long after that time it was before *Damasus* approved that Councell at *Constantinople*, whether one, two, or three yeares, will bee hard for any of the Cardinals friends truly to explane: How soever, seeing it is certaine, that the generall Councell was ended, and the Decrees thereof not onely approved, but put in execution by the Church, before the Pope, I say not, confirmed that Councell; but before hee knew what was done and decred therein, it is a Demonstration, that a generall Councell, or a Decree thereof, may bee, and *de facto*, hath beene judged, by the Church, both of them to bee of full and Synodall authoritie, and approved by the Church, when the Pope had confirmed or approved neither of both.

a *Socr. l. 5. ca. 8.*
b *Vsq; ad finem mensis Iuly producta est. Bar. an. 381. nu 80.*
c *Lib. 3. de fide Cathol. Cod. Theod.*
d *L. 8. de Occid. Imp. an. 381.*
e *An. 381. nu. 97.*
f *Bar. an. eod. nu. 81.*

20. Nay, what if neither *Damasus* nor any of their Popes till *Gregories* time, approved that Councell? *Gregory* himselfe is a witnesse hereof: *The 8 Canons of the Constantinopolitane Councell condemne the Eu-* g *Lib. 6. Epist. 31*

doxians; but who that Eudoxius was, they doe not declare. And the Romane Church, *eoſdem Canones vel geſta Synodi illius, hactenus non habet, nec accipit; neither hath, nor approveth thoſe Canons or Acts; but herein it accepteth that Synod in that which was defined againſt the Macedonians, by it; and it rejecteth thoſe hereſies, which being mentioned therein, were already condemned by other Fathers.* So *Gregory*: By whoſe words it is plaine, that the *Romane Church*, untill *Gregories* time, neither approved the Canons nor Acts of that ſecond generall Councell: Even the condemning of *Macedonius* and his hereſie, was not approved by the Romane Church, *eo nomine*, becauſe it was decreed in that Councell, for then they ſhould have approved the Canon againſt the *Eudoxians*, and all the reſt of their Canons, ſeeing there was the ſelfe-ſame authority of the holy Councell, in decreeing them all; but the reaſon why they approved that againſt the *Macedonians*, was, becauſe Pope [h] *Damaſus* had, in a Romane Synod, divers yeares before [i] the ſecond Councell condemned that hereſie; and what hereſies were by former Fathers condemned, thoſe, and nothing elſe; did the Romane Church approve in that Councell, as *Gregory* ſaith. The inducement moving them was not the authority of the ſecond Councell, but the judgement of other Fathers, for which they accepted of the ſecond Councell therein: and this was untill the dayes or time of *Gregory*; for that is it which *Gregory* intendeth in the former words, *hactenus non habet nec accipit*; not meaning, that till the yeare, wherein he writ that Epiſtle, which was the fifteenth Indiction, the Romane Church received not thoſe Canons or Acts: (for in the ninth Indiction, that is, ſixe yeares before, himſelfe profeſſed [k] to embrace that ſecond Councell, as one of the foure Euangeliſts, which alſo to have beene the judgement of their Church, he [l] witneſſeth in the eleventh Indiction) but untill *Gregories* time; *hactenus*, untill this age, wherein I live, was the ſecond Councell, the Canons or Acts thereof, not had nor approved by the Romane Church: And yet all that time, even from the end of that Councell, was both that Councell held for a generall, lawfull, and approved Synod, and their Decree againſt *Macedonius*, by the whole Church approved, as a Decree of a generall and lawfull Councell, ſuch as ought to binde the whole Church.

h *Anathema inſtigimus Macedonianis. Epiſt. Damaſ. et Synod. Rom. apud Theod. lib. 5. ca. 10.*

i *Concilium illud Romanum habitum eſt tempore Petri Epiſcopi Alexandrini, qui ei interfuit. Zozom. lib. 6. ca. 23. Timotheus vero qui Petro ſucceſſit, ſedit in Concilio Conſtantinopolitano, ut ex ſubſcriptione liquet.*

k *Lib. 2. Epiſt. 24*

l *Lib. 2. Epiſt. 10 Indict. 11.*

21. What wee have ſhewed concerning the Decree againſt the *Macedonians*, and in generall, for the ſecond Councell, that will bee much more evident in the third Canon of that Synod, which concernes the Patriarchall dignity of the See of *Conſtantinople*, his precedence to the Patriarchs of *Alexandria* & *Antioch*, and his authority over the Churches in *Aſia minor*, *Thrace*, and *Pontus*, all which was conferred on that See by that third Canon. That the Church of *Rome*, till *Gregories* time, approved not that Canon, is evident by Pope *Leo*, who in many [m] of his Epiſtles, ſpecially in that to *Anatolius* [n], ſhewes his diſlike of it; yea, rejects it, as contrary to the *Nicene* Decrees, which *Leo* there defineth (but, without doubt, erroniouſly) to bee immutable. The Legates of *Leo*, having inſtructions from him, ſaid openly in the Councell of *Chalcedon* [o], touching the Canons of this Councell, *in Synodicis Canonibus non habentur, they are not accounted or*

m *Epiſt. 54. 55. 61.*

n *Epiſt. 53.*

o *Act. 16. pa. 836. a.*

held

held for Synodall Canons; and following the minde and precept [p] of the Pope, they most earnestly oppugned this third Canon. Long before *Leo* did *Damasus* reject [q] this Canon, *facto decreto in Synodo Romana, making a Decree against it, in a Romane Synod*, which is extant in their Vaticane, as *Turrian*, who belike saw the Decree, doth witnesse. Now seeing that Decree of *Damasus* was made, *statim post secundum Concilium, presently after the second Councell*, and was so strongly corroborated by Pope *Leo*; this may perswade, that none of their Popes before the dayes of *Gregory* would repeale the Decrees of those two Popes. Their owne *Nicholas Sanders* goes further, and saith [r], *That this Canon was not allowed by the Romane Church, till the Councell at Laterane, under Innocentius the third, which is more than sixe hundred yeares after the death of Gregory*: and though he prove this by the testimony of *Guilielmus Tyrius*, yet I insist onely upon the time of *Gregorie*, whose words are very pregnant for this, and the other Canons of that second Councel; the *Romane Church, hactenus non habet nec accipit, did not till these dayes embrace nor approve them.*

22. Now that this same third Canon was all that time, held to be of full authority, and approved by the Church, as a Canon of an holy generall Councell, which bindeth all: notwithstanding the Popes did not approve it, nay, did even by their Synodall Decrees reject it, there are very many and cleare evidences: By warrant of that Canon did *Anatolius in the Councell of Chalcedon* [s], *and Eutichius in the fift Synod* [t], *in the right of their See of Constantinople take place before, and above the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch*; none in those Councels repining thereat: nay, those Synods, and God himselfe (as is there [u] said) approving that precedence: And whereas this order had not beene observed in the *Ephesine Latrocinie*; *Flavianus* Bishop of *Constantinople* being set after the Bishops of *Antioch* and *Ierusalem*, the Bishops of the Councell of *Chalcedon* stormed thereat, and said [x], *Why did not Flavianus sit in his proper place?* that is, next to the Romane Bishop, or his Legates. By authority of the same Canon *did Chrysostome, when he was Bishop of Constantinople, depose* [y] *fifteene Bishops in Asia; ordaine others in their roomes; celebrate* [z] *a Councell at Ephesus, and call the Asian Bishops unto it*; none of which either could he have done, or would the other have obeyed him therein, had it not beene knowne, that they were subject to him as their Patriarke, by that Canon of the second generall Councell, to which they all must obey: And this was done about some twenty yeares after that Canon was made. So quickly was the same in force, and was acknowledged to bee of a binding authority. In the Councell of *Chalcedon*, when the truth of this Canon was most diligently examined, *Elutherius* Bishop of *Chalcedon* said, [b] *Sciens quia per Canones & per consuetudinem; I subscribed hereunto, knowing that the See of Constantinople hath these rights (in Asia and Pontus, as a Patriarke to governe there) both according to the Canons, and according to custome*: and the like was deposed by many Bishops of *Asia* and *Pontus*. They acknowledge, nay, they knew there was such a Canon; they knew also, that the custome and practice did *concurrere cum lege, did concurre with the Canon*; whereupon the glorious Iudges, after full discussing of this cause,

p *Sedes Apostolica quæ nobis præcipit. lib d. pa. 137. b.*

q *Vehementer refutarunt hunc tertium Canonem Leo et Damasus. Turrian. lib de 6, 7, et 8, Synodis. pa. 65. Romana Ecclesia hactenus respuit hunc Canonem. Bin, not. in Conc. 2 § Approbatum*

r *Iam primum (in Concilio Later.) Constantinopolitana sedes Romanæ Ecclesiæ assensum, publice obtinuit, &c. Sand. lib. 7. de visib. Monar. ad an. 1215.*

s *Act. 1. et alijs ubi recensentur Episcopi.*

t *Coll. 1. et alijs.*

u *Ecce nos Deo volente Anatolium primum habemus. Ait Pascasinus in Conc. Chal. Act. 1. pa. 8. b.*

x *Ibid.*

y *S. memorie Chrysostomus 15 Episcopos deposuit in Asia, et pro eis alios ordinavit. Conc. Chalc. Act. 11. in fine. Zozo lib. 1. ca. 6.*

z *Pallad. in vit. Chrys.*

a *Conc. habitum an. 381. Chrysost. creatus Episcopus Cesario et Attico Coss. Socr. lib. 6. ca. 2. id est, circa an. 398 cujus secundo anno, aut circiter, hæc evenerunt.*

b *Act. 16. pa. 136. b.*

cauſe, teſtified [b], and ſentenced, *that the Biſh. of Conſtantinople had right-full authority to ordaine Metropolitane Biſhops in the Dioceſſes of Thrace, Aſia, and Pontus, and the whole Synod conſented to them*; firſt proclaiming, *Hæc juſta eſt ſententia, this is a juſt ſentence, this we ſay all*: and then in the very Synodal Epiſtle [d] to *Leo* teſtifying the ſame, to wit, that they had confirmed that cuſtome to the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, that he ſhould ordaine *Metropolitanes* in *Thrace*, *Aſia*, and *Pontus*; and thereby had confirmed the third Canon of the ſecond Councell. This was the judgement of the whole Councell at *Chalcedon*, that is, of the whole Catholike Church in that age, to which have conſented all Councels, and catholike Biſhops ever ſince: All theſe doe approve, and judge to bee approved that Canon of the ſecond generall *Councell*, which the Popes and Romane Church, not onely not approved, but expreſly and by Synodall decrees rejected.

[b] *Ibid.*

[d] *Relat. ad Leonem poſt act.* 16.

23. About ſome ninety yeares [e] after this, and an hundred ſixty yeares [f] after that ſecond Synod, did *Iuſtinian* the Emperour confirme the [g] Canons, both of that ſecond, and of al the former generall Councels, giving unto them force of Imperiall lawes: Yea, hee further commanded thoſe Canons, (this third among the reſt) *Dipticis inſeri, & prædicari, to be written in the Diptikes or Eccleſiaſticall bookes, and publikely to be read in the Churches, in token of the publike and univerſall approbation of the ſame.* This the fift Councell [h] teſtifieth, as alſo *Victor* [i], and *Evagrius* [k], yea, the Emperour himſelfe alſo, *who both* [l] *profeſſeth that he will not ſuffer this cuſtome to bee taken away, and ſignifieth* [m] *that all Patriarkes are knowne to keepe in their Diptikes, and to recite thoſe Canons in their Churches.* The Emperor doubted not but the Romane Church & Patriarke, as well as the reſt, had done this, and yeelded obedience to ſo holy an Edict; but the Romane Church deluded the Emperour herein: none of them, as *Bellarmine* [n] tels us, did after *Iuſtinians* time, or as he accounts after the yeare 500, *reclamare*, contradict or ſpeake againſt that Canon, (which their ſilence the Emperour and others, not acquainted with the Romane Arts, did interpret to be a conſent) but *Binius* [o] bewrayeth their policy; they, for peace and quietnes ſake (being loth to exaſperate the Emperour) did permit or connive at that honour conferred by the Canon upon the See of *Conſtantinople*; yet, *nunquam à Romana Eccleſia approbatum fuit; it was never*, (thē not til *Gregories* time, which is as much as I intended to prove) *it was never*, ſaith hee, *approved by the Romane Church*; which hee proves by a Decretall of *Innocentius* the third; whence it is evident, ſeeing that Canon of the ſecond generall Councell, was never, as *Binius* avoucheth, but certainly not till *Gregories* time, approved by the Pope, and yet was all that time approved by the catholike Church, even by the great and famous Councell at *Chalcedon*, & al who approve it, who are no fewer than the whole catholike Church; it is evident, I ſay, that it is neither the Popes Approbation which maketh, nor his Reprobation which hindereth a Councell, or any Decree, or Canon thereof, to be an approved generall Councell, or a Synodall Canon, ſuch as doth, and ought to binde all that are in the Church.

[e] *Conc. Chalced. habitum, an.* 451

[f] *Conc. Conſtant. habit. an.* 381.

[g] *Nov.* 131. *ca.* 1, *et.* 2.

[h] *Coll.* 2. *pa.* 524. *a.*

[i] *In Chron. an.* 1. *Iuſtin.*

[k] *Lib.* 4. *ca.* 11.

[l] *Cod. l.* 7. *de ſumma Trin.*

[m] *Nov.* 115.

[n] *Lib.* 1. *de Pont. ca.* 24. *§ His.*

[o] *Not. in Conc.* 2 *§. Conſtantinop.*

24. The Popes Approbation it is not: but what it is which makes a generall

a generall Councell or Canon thereof, to be an approved Councell, or an approved Canon, and for such to bee righly accounted, is not so easie to explane. This in an other Treatise I have at large handled, to which, if it ever see the light, I refetre my selse; yet suffer me to touch in this place so much as may serve to cleare this, and divers other doubts, which are obvious in their writings concerning this point.

25. That every Councell and Synodall decree thereof is approved or confirmed by those Bishops who are present in that Synod, who consent upon that decree, is by the Acts of the Councells most evident. For both their consenting judgement pronounced by word of mouth, and after that, their subscription to their decree, did ratifie and confirme their sentence. In that which they call the eighth generall Synod, after the sentence pronounced, the Popes Legates said [p], *Oportet ut hac manu nostra subscribendo confirmemus, it is needfull that wee confirme these things which we have decreed, by our subscribing unto them.* Of the great Nicene Councell *Eusebius* thus writeth [q], *Those things which with one consent they had decreed,* ἐκύρωσαν ἐγγράφως, *they were fully authorized, ratified, confirmed or approved,* (the Greeke word is very emphaticall) *by their subscription.* In the Councell of *Chalcedon*, when the agreement betwixt *Iuvenalis* and *Maximus* was decreed, they subscribed [r] in this forme; That which is consented upon, *confirmo, I by my sentence doe confirme*; or, *firma esse decerno*, I decree that it shall be firme: and to the like effect subscribed all the rest. Whereupon the glorious Iudges, without expecting any other confirmation either from Pope *Leo*, or any that was absent, said; This which is consented upon shall abide firme, *in omni tempore, for ever by our decree, and by the sentence of the Synod.* Of the second generall Councell, a Synod at *Hellespont* said [s], *Hanc Synodum Timotheus unà cum eis præsens firmavit, Timotheus, with the other Bishops, then present, confirmed this Synod.* The consent and subscription of the Bishops present in the Synod, they call a *Confirmation* of the Synod. In the Synod [t] at *Mæsia*, after the sentence of the Synod was given, they all subscribed in this forme, I M.P.D. &c. *confirmavi & subscripsi, have confirmed this Synodall sentence, and subscribed unto it.* In the second Councell at *Carthage*, held about the time of Pope *Celestine*, *Gennadius* said [u], *Quæ ab omnibus sunt dicta propria debemus subscriptione firmare, what hath beene said and decreed by us all, wee ought by our owne subscriptions to confirme:* and all the Bishops answered, *Fiat, fiat, let us so doe*; and then they subscribed. So cleare it is, that whatsoever decree is made by any Councell, the same is truly and rightly said to bee confirmed by those very Bishops who make the Decree; confirmed I say, both by their joint consent in making that Decree, and by their subscribing unto it when it is made.

[p] *Act.* 10.

[q] *Lib.* 3. *de vita Constant. ca.* 13.

[r] *Act.* 6.

[s] *Extat inter Epist. post Concil. Chal. pa.* 168. *a.*

[t] *Extat ibid. pa.* 155.

[u] *Tom.* 1. *Conc. pa.* 541.

26. Vpon this confirmation or approbation of any Decree by the Bishops present in the Councell, doth the whole strength and authority of any Synodall decree rely; and upon no other confirmation of any Bishop whatsoever, when the Councell is generall and lawfull. For in such a Councell, lawfully called, lawfully governed, and lawfully proceeding, as well in the free discussing, as free sentencing of the cause; there is in true account the joynt consent of all Bishops and

Eccleſiaſticall perſons in the whole world. No Biſhop can then complaine that either he is not called, or not admitted with freedome into ſuch a Councell, unleſſe that he be excommunicated, or ſuſpended, or for ſome ſuch like reaſon juſtly debarred. If all do come, they may and doe freely deliver their owne judgement; and that not onely for themſelves, but for all the Preſbyters in their whole Dioceſſe. For ſeeing the paſtorall care of every Dioceſſe, even from the Apoſtles time, and by them is committed to the Biſhop thereof, (all the reſt being by him admitted but onely into a part of his care, and to aſſiſt him in ſome parts of his Epiſcopall function) he doth, at leaſt (becauſe he ſhould) he is ſuppoſed to admit none, but ſuch as hee knoweth to profeſſe the ſame faith with himſelfe: whence it is, that in his voice is included the judgement of his whole Dioceſan Church, and of all the Preſbyters therein: they all beleeving as he doth, ſpeake alſo in the Councell by his mouth, the ſame that he doth. If ſome of the Biſhops come not perſonally, but either depute others in their roomes, or paſſe their ſuffrage (as often they did) in the voice of their Metropolitan, then their conſent is expreſſed in theirs, whom they put in truſt to be their agents at that time. If any negligently abſent themſelves, neither perſonally, nor yet by delegates ſignifying their minde, theſe are ſuppoſed to give a tacit conſent unto the judgement which is given by them who are preſent; whom the others are ſuppoſed to thinke not onely to be able and ſufficient without themſelves to define that cauſe; but that they will define it in ſuch ſort as themſelves doe wiſh and deſire: for otherwiſe they would have afforded their preſence, or at leaſt ſent ſome deputies to aſſiſt them in ſo great and neceſſary a ſervice. If any out of ſtomack or hatred to the truth, do wilfully refuſe to come, becauſe they diſſent from the others in that doctrine, yet even theſe alſo are in the eie of reaſon ſuppoſed to give an implicit conſent unto that which is decreed, yea though *explicitè* they doe diſſent from it. For every one doth, and in reaſon is ſuppoſed to conſent on this generall point, that a Synodall judgement muſt bee given in that doubt & controverſie, there being no better nor higher humane Court than is that of a generall Councell, by which they may bee directed. Now becauſe there never poſſibly could any Synodall judgement be given, if the wilfull abſence of one or a few ſhould bee a juſt barre to their ſentence; therefore all in reaſon are thought to conſent that the judgement muſt be given by thoſe who will come, or who do come to the Councell, and that their decree or ſentence ſhall ſtand for the judgement of a generall Councell, notwithſtanding their abſence who wilfully refuſe to come.

27. If then all the Biſhops preſent in the Councell do conſent upon any decree, there is in it one of thoſe wayes which we have mentioned, either by perſonall declaration, or by ſignification made by their delegates and agents, or by a tacit, or by an implicit conſent, the conſenting judgement of all the Biſhops and Preſbyters in the whole Church, that is, of al who either have judicatory power or authoritie to preach publikely; and therefore ſuch a decree is as fully authorized, confirmed, and approved, as if all the Biſhops and Preſbyters in the world

world had perſonally ſubſcribed in this manner, I confirme this Decree. Hereof there is a worthy example in the third generall Councell. No Preſbyters at all were therein, not in their owne right. Very many Biſhops were perſonally abſent, and preſent onely by their Legates or Agents; as almoſt all the Weſterne Biſhops, and by name *Celeſtine* Patriarch of *Rome*. Some, no queſtion, upon other occaſions neglected that buſineſſe; as, it may be, the Biſhops of *Gangra*, and of *Heraclea* in *Macedonia*, who were not at this Councell. Divers others wilfully and obſtinately refuſed to come to that holy Synod; as by name *Neſtorius* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, *Iohn* Patriarch of *Antioch*, and ſome forty Biſhops, who at the ſame time while the holy Councell was held in the Church at *Epheſus*, held a Conventicle by themſelves in an Inne, in the ſame Citie; and yet notwithſtanding the perſonall abſence of the firſt, the negligent of the ſecond, and wilfull abſence of the laſt, the holy [x] generall Councell ſaith of their Synodall judgement, given by thoſe who were then preſent, that it was *nihil aliud quam communis & concors terrarum orbis ſenſus & conſenſus, nothing elſe but the common and conſenting judgment of the whole world.* How could this be, when ſo many Biſhops, beſides three Patriarchs, were either perſonally, or negligently, or wifully abſent? How was there in that decree the conſent of theſe? Truly becauſe they all (even all the Biſhops in the world) did either perſonally, or by their Agents, expreſſe; or elſe in ſuch a tacit and implicit manner (as wee declared) wrap up their judgement in the Synodall decree made by the Biſhops preſent in the Councell.

x *Epiſt. Conc. Epheſ. ad Imper. tom. 2. Act. Con. Epheſ. epiſt. 17.*

28. But what if many of thoſe who are preſent, doe diſſent from that which the reſt being the greater part doe decree? Truly, even theſe alſo doe *implicitè*, and are in reaſon to bee judged to conſent to that ſame decree. For every one is ſuppoſed to agree on that generall Maxime of reaſon, that in ſuch an aſſembly of Iudges, what the greater part decreeth ſhall ſtand as the Act and Iudgement of the whole: ſeeing otherwiſe it would be impoſſible that ſuch a multitude of Biſhops ſhould ever give any judgement in a cauſe, for ſtill ſome in perverſeneſſe and pertinacie would diſſent. Seeing then it is the ordinance of God that the Church ſhall judge, and ſeeing there can no other meanes be deviſed how they ſhould judge, unleſſe the ſentence of the greater part may ſtand for their judgement, reaſon enforceth all to conſent upon this Maxime. Vpon this is that Imperiall Law grounded, *Quod* [y] *major pars curiæ effecit, pro rato habetur, acſi omnes id egerint, what the greater part of the Court ſhall do, that is ratified, or to ſtand for the judgement of the Court, as if all had done the ſame.* And againe, *Refertur* [z] *ad univerſos quod publicè fit per majorem partem: That is accounted the act of all, which is publikely done by the greater part.* Vpon this ground is that truly ſaid by *Bellarmine* [a], *That whereon the greater part doth conſent, eſt verum decretum Concilij, is the true decree of the Councell*, even of the whole Councell. Vpon the equitie of this rule was it ſaid in the Councell at *Chalcedon* [b], when ten Biſhops diſſented from the reſt, *Non eſt juſtum decem audiri, It is not juſt that the ſentence of ten ſhould prevaile againſt a thouſand and two hundred Biſhops.* Vpon the equitie of the

y *Dig. lib. 50. leg. 19.*

z *Dig. lib. 5. tit. 17. de Reg. Iuris 160.*

a *Lib. 2. de Conc. ca. 11. §. At.*

b *Act. 4. p. 90. b.*

the ſame rule did the fift generall Councell truly & conſtantly judge [c], *that the Councell of Chalcedon even in that definition of faith, which they all with one conſent agreed upon, condemned the Epiſtle of Ibas as hereticall; although they knew that Maximus, with Paſcaſinus, and the other Legats of Pope Leo, in the Councell of Chalcedon, adjudged that Epiſtle to be orthodoxall.* How was it the conſenting judgement of the whole Councell of *Chalcedon*, when yet ſome did expreſſe their diſſent therein? How, but by that implicit conſent which all give to that rule of reaſon, that the judgement of the greater part ſhall ſtand for the judgment of the whole; which the fift Councell doth plainly ſignifie, ſaying [d], In Councels we muſt not attend the interloquutions of one or two, but what is defined in common, *ab omnibus, aut ampliorib⁹, either by all, or by the greater part:* to that we muſt attend as to the judgement of the whole Councell. But omitting all the reſt, there is one example in the Councell of *Chalcedon* moſt pregnant to this purpoſe.

c Coll. 6. p. 576. b

d Ibid. pa. 563. b.

29. All [e] the Councell, ſave onely the Popes Legates, conſented upon that third Canon, decreed in the ſecond, and now confirmed in this fourth Councell, that the See of *Conſtantinople* ſhould have Patriarchall dignity over *Thrace*, *Aſia*, and *Pontus*, and have precedence before other Patriarches, as the next after the Biſhop of Rome. The Legates following the inſtructions of *Leo*, were ſo averſe in this matter, that they ſaid [f] not without ſome choler, *Contradictio noſtra his geſtis inhæreat; Let our contradiction cleave to theſe Acts:* and ſo it doth, to the eternall diſgrace both of them and their maſter. The glorious Iudges notwithſtanding this diſſenting of the Legates and of Pope *Leo* himſelfe in them, ſaid [g] concerning that Canon, That which we have ſpoken, (that the See of Conſtantinople ought to be the ſecond, &c.) *Tota Synodus, the whole Councell hath approved it.* Why, but the Popes Legates approved it not; they contradicted it. True, in this particular they diſſented. But becauſe they as all other Biſhops, even Pope *Leo* himſelfe, conſented unto that generall Maxime, That the judgement of the greater part ſhall ſtand for the judgement of the whole Councell, in that generall both the Legats of *Leo*, and *Leo* himſelfe, did *implicitè* and virtually conſent to that very Canon, from which actually and *explicitè* they did then diſſent. For which cauſe the moſt prudent Iudges truly ſaid, *Tota Synodus, the whole Councell hath approved this Canon:* either *explicitè* or *implicitè*, either expreſſely or virtually approved it. Neither did onely thoſe ſecular Iudges ſo eſteeme, the whole generall Councell it ſelfe profeſſed the ſame, and that even in the Synodall Relation of their Acts to Pope *Leo*: The univerſall [h] Synod ſaid thus, *We have condemned Dioſcorus, we have confirmed the faith, wee have confirmed the Canon of the ſecond Councell for the honour of the See of Conſtantinople, we have condemned the hereſie of Eutyches:* Thus writ the whole Councell to *Leo*, declaring evidently that act of approving that Canon to be the Act of the whole Synod, although they knew the contradiction of the Pope and his Legates to cleave unto it.

e Hæc omnes dicimus, hæc omnibus placent. Act. 16. pa. 137. a.

f Ibid. pa. 137. b.

g Ibid.

h Sancta & univerſal. Synod. Leoni. Relat. Synod. poſt Act. 16

30. You ſee now that in every ſentence of a generall and lawfull Councell there is an aſſent of all Biſhops and Preſbyters, they all either *explicitè*, or *tacitè*, or *implicitè*, conſenting to that decree, whether

ther they be abſent or preſent, and whether in that particular they conſent or diſſent. Now becauſe there can bee no greater humane judgement in any cauſe of faith or eccleſiaſticall matter, than is the conſenting judgement of all Biſhops and Preſbyters, that is, of all who have power either to teach or judge in thoſe cauſes; it hence clearly enſueth, that there neither is nor can be any Epiſcopall or Eccleſiaſticall confirmation or approbation whatſoever of any decree, greater, ſtronger, or of more authority, then is the judgement it ſelfe of ſuch a generall Councell, and their owne confirmation or approbation of the decrees which they make; for in every ſuch decree there is the conſent of all the Biſhops and Preſbyters in the whole world.

31. Beſides this confirmation of any ſynodall decree, which is by Biſhops, and therefore to bee called *Epiſcopall*, there is alſo another confirmation added by Kings and Emperors, which is called *Royall* or *Imperiall*, by this later, religious Kings not onely give freedome and liberty, that thoſe decrees of the Councell ſhall ſtand in force of Eccleſiaſticall Canons within their dominions, ſo that the contemners of them may be with allowance of Kings, corrected by Eccleſiaſticall cenſures, but further alſo, doe ſo ſtrengthen, and backe the ſame by their ſword, and civill authority, that the contradicters of thoſe decrees, are made liable to thoſe temporall puniſhments, which are ſet downe in *Ezra* [i], *to death, to baniſhment, to confiſcation of goods, or to impriſonment*, as the quality of the offence ſhall require, and the wiſedome of that Imperiall State ſhall think fit. Betwixt theſe two confirmations, *Epiſcopall* and *Imperiall*, there is exceeding great oddes and difference. By the former, judiciall ſentence is given, and the ſynodall decree made or declared to be made, for which cauſe it may rightly be called a judiciall or definitive confirmation: by the later, neither is the ſynodal decree made, nor any judgment given to define that cauſe (for neither Princes nor any Lay men, are Iudges to decide thoſe matters, as the Emperours *Theodoſius* and *Valentinian* excellently declare in [k] their directions to *Candidianus*, in the Councell of *Epheſus*;) but the ſynodall decree being already made by the Biſhops, and their judgement given in that cauſe, is ſtrengthened by Imperiall authority, for which cauſe, this may fitly be called a ſupereminēt or corroborative confirmation of the ſynodall judgement. The former confirmation is *Directive*, teaching what all are to beleeve or obſerve in the Church: the later is *Coactive*, compelling all, by civill puniſhment to beleeve or obſerve the Synodall directions. The former is *Eſſentiall* to the Decree, ſuch as if it want, there is no Synodall decree made at all: the later is *Accidentall*, which though it want, yet is the Decree of the Councell, a true Synodall Decree and ſentence. The former bindes all men to obedience to that Decree, but yet onely under paine of Eccleſiaſticall cenſures: the latter bindes the ſubjects only of thoſe Princes, who give the Royall Confirmation to ſuch Decrees, and binds them under the pain only of temporal puniſhmēt. By vertue of the former, the contradicters or contemners of thoſe Decrees are rightly to be accounted either heretikes in cauſes of faith, or contumacious in other matters, and ſuch are truly ſubject to the cenſures of the

i Ezr. 7. 16.

k *Neſas eſt eum qui Epiſcoporum catalogo adſcriptus non eſt, Eccleſiaſticis negotijs ſe immiſcere.* (*nempe ut Iudicē qui definiat.*) *Epiſt. Imp. ad Synod. Epheſ. to. 1. Act. Epheſ. Conc. ca. 32.*

the Church, though, if the later be wanting, thoſe cenſures cannot bee inflicted by any, or upon any, but with danger to incurre the indignation of Princes: By vertue of the later, not onely the Church may ſafely, yea, with great allowance and praiſe, inflict their Eccleſiaſticall cenſures, but inferiour Magiſtrates alſo may, nay ought to proceed againſt ſuch contemners of thoſe Synodall decrees, as againſt notorious, convicted, and condemned heretikes; or in cauſes which are not of faith, but of externall diſcipline and orders, as againſt contumacious perſons. The Epiſcopall confirmation is the firſt in order, but yet becauſe it proceeds from thoſe who are all ſubject to Imperiall authority, it is in dignitie *inferiour*. The Imperiall confirmation is the laſt in order, but becauſe it proceeds from thoſe to whom everie ſoule is ſubject, it is in dignity *Supreme*.

32. This Imperiall confirmation, as holy generall Councels did with all ſubmiſſion intreate of Emperours, ſo religious Emperors did with all willingneſſe grant unto them. Of the great *Nicene* Councell *Euſebius* ſaith [l], *Conſtantine ſealed, ratified, and confirmed the decrees which were made therein*. The ſecond general Councel writ [m] thus to the Emperour *Theodoſius*, *We beſeech your clemency, that by your letters, ratum eſſe jubeas confirmeſque Concilij decretum, that you would ratifie and confirme the decree of this Councell*: and that the Emperour did ſo, his Emperiall Edict, before [n] mentioned, doth make evident. To the third Councell the Emperor writ thus [o], *Let matters cõcerning religion and pietie be diligently examined, contention being laid aſide; ac tum demũ à noſtra pietate confirmationem expectate; and then expect from us our imperiall confirmation*. The holy Councell having done ſo, writ [p] thus to the Emperour, *We earneſtly intreate your piety, ut jubeat ea omnia, that you would cõmand, that all which is done by this holy and Oecumenical Councell againſt Neſtorius, may ſtand in force, per veſtræ pietatis nutum et conſenſum confirmata; being confirmed by your roall aſſent*: And that the Emperour yeelded to their requeſt, his Edict [q] againſt *Neſtorius* doth declare. In the fourth Councell the Emperour ſaid [r], *We come to this Synod, not to ſhew our power, ſed ad confirmandam fidem, but to confirme the faith*. And whẽ he had ſignified before all the Biſhops his royall aſſent [ſ] to their decree, the whole Councell cryed out, *Orthodoxam fidem tu confirmaſti, thou haſt confirmed the Catholike faith*: often ingeminating thoſe joyfull acclamations. That *Juſtinian* confirmed the fift Councell, his imperiall Edict for condemning thoſe *Three Chapters*, which after the Synodall judgment ſtood in more force than before; his ſeverity [t] in puniſhing the contradicters of the Synodall ſentence, partly by exile, partly by impriſonment, are cleare witneſſes. The ſixt Councell ſaid [u] thus to the Emperour, *O our moſt gracious Lord grant this favour unto us, ſignaculum tribue, ſeale and ratifie all that we have done; veſtram inſcribito imperialem ratihabitionem; adde unto them your imperiall confirmation, that by your holy Edicts, and godly conſtitutions they may ſtand in firme force*. And the Emperour upon their humble requeſt, ſet forth his Edict, wherein he ſaith [x], We have publiſhed this our Edict, *that we might, corroborare atque confirmare ea quæ definita ſunt, corroborate and confirme thoſe things which are defined by the Councell*. To all which, that may bee added which

l *Lib. 4. de vita Conſtant. ca 27.*
m *Epiſt. Synod. 2. poſt Act. Concil. pa. 518.*
n *Hoc. cap. nu. 19.*
o *Act Epheſ. Conc to m. 3. ca. 17.*
p *Act. Couc. Eph. to. 4 ca. 8.*
q *Imperator ſententia Synodi publicè approbata, Neſtorio exilium indicit. Act. Con. Eph. to. 5. ca. 11. et lege ult. de hæret. Cod. Theod.*
r *Act. 6.*
ſ *In perpetuum quæ à vobis terminata ſunt ſerventur. Ibid.*
t *Vict. in Chron. an. poſt Coſſ. Baſ. 13, 14, 15, &c.*
u *Act. 18.*
x *Edict. Conſtat. Pogon. Act. 18. Conc. 6.*

which *Basilius* the Emperour ſaid in the eighth Synod, as they call it; *I had*[y] *purpoſed to have ſubſcribed after al the Biſhops, as did my predeceſſors, Conſtantine the great, Theodoſius, Martian, and the reſt*: thereby evidently teſtifying, not onely the cuſtome of imperiall confirmation to have been obſerved in all former Councels, but the difference alſo betwixt it and the Epiſcopall ſubſcription; the Biſhops firſt ſubſcribing, and thereby making or declaring, that they had made a Synodall decree; the Emperours after them all ſubſcribing, as ratifying by their Imperiall confirmation what the Biſhops had decreed. [y] *Act.* 10.

33. By this now it fully appeareth, what it is which maketh any Synod or any Synodal decree, to be, and juſtly to be accounted an approved Synod, or an approved Synodall and Oecumenicall decree. It is not the Popes aſſent, approbation, or confirmation, (as they, without all ground of truth doe fancy,) which at any time did, or poſſibly can doe this. It is onely the Vniverſall and Oecumenicall conſent of the whole Church, and of all the members thereof, upon any decree made by a generall Councell, which truly makes that an approved decree; which generall and Oecumenicall conſent or approbation, is ſhewed partly by the Epiſcopall confirmation of that decree, made by the Biſhops preſent therein, wherein there is ever either an expreſſe, or a vertuall and implicite conſent of all the Biſhops and Preſbyters, and ſo of all the Clergy in the world; partly by the royall and imperiall confirmation given to that decree by Chriſtian Kings and Emperours, in which there is an implicite conſent of all Laickes in the whole Church, Kings and Princes aſſenting not onely for themſelves, but in the name of all their Lay ſubjects, for whom they undertake, that either they ſhall willingly obey that decree, or elſe by ſeverity of puniſhments, be compelled thereunto. If theſe two confirmations, or either of them be wanting, the Councell and decree which is ſuppoſed to be made therein, is neither an approved or confirmed Councell, nor decree, though the Pope ſend forth ten thouſand Buls to approve and confirme the ſame: But if theſe two confirmations concurre in any decree of a generall and lawfull Councel, though the Pope reprobate and reject that Councell or decree never ſo often, yet is both that Councell an approved generall Councel, and the decree thereof an approved or confirmed Synodall and Oecumenicall decree, approved I ſay, and confirmed by the greateſt humane authority and judgement that poſſibly can bee, either found, or deſired, even by the whole catholike Church, and every member, whether Eccleſiaſticall or Laicall, therein: And whoſoever after ſuch an ample approbation or confirmation, ſhall at any time contradict or contemne ſuch a Councell or decree, he doth not, nor can he thereby impare the dignity and authority of it, but he demonſtrates himſelfe to be an heretike, or, at leaſt, a contumacious perſon, inſolently, and in the pride of his ſingularity deſpiſing that judgement of the Councell, which the whole Church, and every member thereof, yea, even himſelfe alſo among them, hath approved.

34. You will yet demand of mee, why generall Councels have ſought the Popes approbation and confirmation of their decrees, (as did

did the Councell of *Chalcedon* [z] of Pope *Leo*) after the end of the Synods; and what effect or fruit did arise from such confirmations, if it added no greater authority to the Synodall sentence, than before it had? I also aske of you another question; Why did the Councell of *Constantinople* confirme [a] the *Nicene* Synod, and the faith decreed therein? or why did the Councell of *Chalcedon* confirme [b] all the three former generall Councels? or why did their second *Nicene* confirme all the sixe Synods which were before it, saying [c], *Eorum constitutionem integram & illabefactabilem confirmamus; we confirme the divine Canons and constitutions, being inviolable?* Was not the great Nicene Councell and decree of faith, of as great authority before it was confirmed by the second or fourth Councel, as afterwards? or what greater strength and authority had either it, or any of the sixe first generall Councels, by the confirmation of the second Nicene Synod, which, unto all the former, is as much inferiour, as is drosse or clay to the gold of *Ophir*. If the confirmations of one generall Councell by another, give no greater authority unto it than before it had, (as it is certain by these examples, that it doth not) what marvell if the Popes confirmation doe not worke that effect? If notwithstanding all this, the confirmations of former, by subsequent Councels, bee not fruitlesse; truly, neither the confirmation of the Pope, or any other Bishop that is absent, must bee thought fruitlesse, though it adde no more authority to the Synod, or Synodall decrees, than before they had.

35. Neither did only general, but even Provincial Councels, yea, particular Bishops confirme generall Synods, and the decrees therof. The Synod at *Millane* was assembled by the direction of Pope *Leo*, in which the Acts of the first Ephesine Councell, *per subscriptionem Episcoporum absentium sunt confirmata; were confirmed by the subscription of those Bishops, who were absent*. So writeth [d] *Binius*. The like was done after the Councell of *Chalcedon*; for when some began to quarrell at it, *Leo* the Emperour, that he might, *confirmare* [e] *ea, confirme the decrees of that Councell*, published an Edict to that end, at the sollicitation of Pope *Leo* [f]; yea further, the Emperour commanded the severall Bishops to shew their judgements in that doctrine of faith decreed at *Chalcedon*, which he did to this end, *ut omnium calculo & confessione Chalcedonense Concilium iterum firmaretur*, saith *Binius* [m]; *that the Councell of Chalcedon might be confirmed againe by the consent and confession of all those Bishops*. They did what the Emperour commanded them: some alone, as *Anatolius*, *Sebastianus*, *Lucianus*, *Agapetus*, and many moe; some in Synodal Epistles, as the Bishops of *Alexandria*, of *Europe*; all whose letters are adjoyned to the Councell of *Chalcedon* [n]: concerning all which, that is to be noted which *Agapetus* saith [o], *Pene omnes occidentalium partium Episcopi confirmaverunt, atque consignaverunt; almost all the Bishops of the West*, (and so also in the East) *did confirme by their letters and subscriptions, that faith which was explaned at Chalcedon*. What authority thinke you, could the confirmation of one single Bishop, as of *Agapetus* and *Sebastianus*, or of a Synod consisting but of nineteene Bishops, (as that at *Millan* [p]) or but of seven [q], or sixe [r], or five [s], or foure [t], (as some of the other) give to the great and Oecumenicall Councels of *Ephesus*

z *Rogamus tuis decretis nostrum honora judicium. Epist. Synod. Chal. ad Leonem post Act. 16.*
a *Statuerunt 318. Patrum fidem firmam ac stabilem manere oportere. Conc. Const. ca. 1.*
b *In definit. fidei Act. 5. Confirmavimus Patrum 150. regulam Epist. Conc. Chal. ad Leonē post Act. 16. Conc. Chal. prædicta concilia firmavit. Epist. Episc. Europæ post Cōc. Chal pa. 152.*
d *Not. in Conc. Rom. 3. tempore Silvestri.*
e *Bin. not. in Conc. Chale.*
§ *Incipiunt pa. 190.*
f *Epist 73. hoc classico Pontificiis Imperator excitatus sanctionem edidit. Bin. not. in eam Epist.*
m *Locis citatis.*
n *Pa. 146. ad pa. 179.*
o *Pa. 166.*
p *Vt liquet ex eorum epist. Synod. quæ extat post Epist. 52. Leonis.*
q *Vt Epis. Syriæ post Conc. Chal. pa. 155. b.*
r *Vt Epis. Mæsiæ ibid. a.*
s *Vt Epis. secundæ Syriæ. Ibid. pa. 157. b.*
t *Vt Epis. Osroēniæ. Ibid. pa. 168. a.*

Epheſus and *Chalcedon*, approved not onely by the Popes, but by the conſenting judgement of the whole (Chriſtian) world, as out of the *Epheſine* Synod we before declared: And yet was never one of thoſe confirmations fruitleſſe, as Pope *Leo*, who was the author of them, rightly judged. Of the great *Nicene* Councell, *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Nicomedia*, and *Theognis* Biſhop of *Nice*, after they had endured exile for not conſenting to the *Nicene* faith, in token of their repentance, writ [u] thus unto the Synod, *Thoſe things which are decreed by your judgement, conſentientibus animis confirmare decrevimus, we are purpoſed to confirme with conſenting mindes.* Even the conſent of two, and thoſe exiled and hereticall Biſhops, is called a confirmation of the great Nicene Councell, to which no authority was added therby. I will but add one example more, and that is of this our fift Councell; concerning which, in their ſecond Nicene Synod, it is thus ſaid [x], *Foure Patriarkes being preſent, approved the ſame, and the moſt religious Emperour ſent the Synodall Acts thereof to Ieruſalem*; where a Synod being aſſembled, all the Biſhops of *Paleſtina, manibus, & pedibus, & ore, ſententiam Synodi confirmarunt*; *they all confirmed the ſentence of this Councell, with their hands, with their confeſsions, and full conſent*, except onely one *Alexander* Biſhop of *Abyles*, who thought the contrary, and therefore was put from his Biſhopricke; and comming to *Conſtantinople* was ſwallowed up by an earthquake. So their Nicene Synod: By all which it is now cleare, that generall and appoved Oecumenicall Councels, or the decrees thereof, may bee, and, *de facto*, have beene uſually approved and confirmed not onely by the Pope, but by other ſucceding generall Councels, by Provinciall Synods, yea, by particular Biſhops, who have beene abſent, none of all which gave, or could give more authority to the Councell or Synodall decree thereof, than it had before; and ſome of them are both in authority and dignity not once to bee compared to thoſe Synods which they doe approve or confirme; and yet not any one of al theſe confirmations were needleſſe, or fruitleſſe.

u *Epiſtola eorum extat apud Socratem lib. 1. ca. 10.*

x *Act. 1. pa. 306*

36. The reaſon of all which may be perceived by the divers ends of thoſe two cõfirmations. Theſe uſe & end of the firſt confirmation by the Biſhops preſent in the Councell, was judicially to determine and define the controverſie then propoſed, and to give unto it the full and perfect authority of a Synodall Oecumenicall decree, that is in truth, the whole ſtrength and authority which all the Biſhops and Churches in the whole world could give unto it. The uſe and end of the ſecond confirmation by thoſe Biſhops, who were abſent, was not judicially to define that cauſe, or give any judgment therein, (for this was done already, and in as effectuall a manner as poſſible it could bee) but to preſerve the peace of the Church, and unity in faith, which could by no other meanes be better effected, than if Biſhops, who had been abſent, and therefore did but *implicitè*, or by others, conſent to thoſe decrees at the making thereof, did afterwards declare their owne explicite and expreſſe conſent to the ſame. Now becauſe the more eminent that any Biſhop was, either for authority or learning, the more likely he was, either to make a rent and ſchiſme in the Church, if hee ſhould diſſent, or to procure the tranquility and peace of the

Church, if hee ſhould conſent; hence it was, that if any Patriarke, Patriarchall Primate, or other eminent Biſhop were abſent at the time of the Councell, the Church and Councell did the more earneſtly labour to have his expreſſe conſent and confirmation to the Synodall decrees: This was the cauſe why both the religious Emperour *Theodoſius* [y], and *Cyrill*, with other orthodoxall Biſhops, were ſo earneſt to have *Iohn* Patriarke of *Antioch*, to conſent to the holy *Epheſine* Synod, which long before was ended; that as he had beene the ringleader to the factious conventicle, and thoſe who defended *Neſtorius* with his hereſie; ſo his yeelding to the truth, and embracing the Epheſine Councell, which condemned *Neſtorius*, might draw many others to doe the like, and ſo indeed it did. This was the principall reaſon why ſome of the ancient Councels, as that by name of *Chalcedon*, (for all did it not) ſought the Popes confirmation to their Synodall decrees; not thinking their ſentence in any cauſe to bee invalid, or their Councell no approved Councell, if it wanted his approbation or confirmation, (a fancy not dreamed of in the Church in thoſe daies) but wheras the Pope was never perſonally preſent in any of thoſe w^ch^ they account the 8 general Councels, the Synod thought it fit to procure, if they could, his expreſſe and explicite conſent to their decrees, that he being the chiefe Patriarch in the Church, might by his example move all, and by his authoritie draw his owne Patriarchall Dioceſſe (as uſually hee did) to conſent to the ſame decrees; whereas, if he ſhould happen to diſſent (as *Vigilius* did at the time of the fift Councell) hee was likely to cauſe (as *Vigilius* then did) a very grievous rent and ſchiſme in the Church of God.

[y] Sacra Imper. ad Iohan. to. 5. Act. Eph. Conc. ca. 3. Cyril. Epiſt. 38. ad Dynatum to. eod. ca. 16.

37. There was yet another uſe and end of thoſe ſubſequent confirmations, whether by ſucceeding Councels, or abſent Biſhops: and that was, that every one ſhould thereby either teſtifie his orthodoxy in the faith, or elſe manifeſt himſelfe to bee an heretike: For as the approving of the ſix generall Councels, and their decrees of faith did witneſſe one to be a Catholike in thoſe doctrines; ſo the very refuſing to approve or confirme any one of thoſe Councels, or their decrees of faith, was *ipſo facto*, without any further examination of the cauſe, an evident conviction that he was a condemned heretike; ſuch an one, as in the pride and pertinacie of his heart rejected that holy ſynodall judgement, which all the whole catholike Church, and every member thereof; even himſelfe alſo had *implicitè* before confirmed and approved. In which reſpect an heretike may truly bee called αὐτοκατάκριτος, being convicted and condemned not onely by the evidence of truth, and by ſynodall ſentence, but even by that judgment which his owne ſelfe had given *implicitè*, in the decree of the Councell. The ſumme is this; The former confirmation by the Biſhops preſent in the Synod, is *Iudiciall*; the later confirmation by the Biſhops who are abſent, is *Pacificall*. The former is *authoritative*, ſuch as gives the whole authority to any decree: the later (whether by ſucceeding Councels, or abſent Biſhops) is *Teſtificative*, ſuch as witneſſeth them to be orthodoxall in that decree. The former, joyned to the Imperiall confirmation, is *Eſſentiall*, which eſſentially makes both the Councell,

cell an approved Councel, & all the decrees therof, approved, ſynodal, and Oecumenicall decrees: the later is *accidentall*, which being granted by a Biſhop, doth much grace himſelfe, but little or nothing the Synod; and being denyed by any, doth no whit at all either diſgrace the Synod, or impare the dignity and authority thereof, but doth extreamely diſgrace the partie himſelfe who denyeth it, and puls downe upon him, both the juſt cenſures of the Church, and thoſe civill puniſhments which are due to heretikes or contumacious perſons.

38. My concluſion now is this: Seeing this fift Councell was both for the calling generall, and for the proceeding therin lawfull, and orderly; and ſeeing, although it wanted the Popes conſent, yet it had the concurrence of thoſe two confirmations, before mentioned; *Epiſcopall* and *Imperiall*, in which is included the Oecumenicall approbation of the whole catholike Church: it hence therefore enſueth, that as from the firſt aſſembling of the Biſhops it was an holy, a lawfull, and Oecumenicall Councell; ſo from the firſt pronouncing of their ſynodall ſentence, and the Imperiall aſſent added thereunto, it was an approved generall Councell, approved by the whole catholike Church; and ſo approved, that without any expreſſe conſent of the Pope added unto it, it was of as great worth, dignity, and authoritie, as if all the Popes ſince *S. Peters* time had, with their owne hands ſubſcribed unto it. And this may ſuffice to ſatisfie the fourth and laſt exception which *Baronius* deviſed to excuſe *Vigilius* from hereſie.

Cap. XIX.

The true notes to know which are generall *and* lawfull, *and which either are not* generall, *or being* generall, *are no* lawfull Councels; *with divers examples of both kindes.*

1. THAT which hath beene ſaid in the former Chapter is ſufficient to refute that cavill of *Baronius*, againſt the fift Councell, whereby he pretends it to have neither been a generall, nor a lawfull Synod, becauſe the Pope reſiſted the aſſembling, and contradicted the decree and ſentence thereof; but for as much as it is not victory, but truth which I ſeeke, and the full ſatisfaction of the reader in this cauſe, and ſeeing this point about the lawfulneſſe of generall Councels, is frequent, and very obvious, and ſuch as being rightly conceived, will give great light to this whole controverſie about Councels; I will crave liberty to lanch ſomewhat further into this deepe, and explane, with what convenient brevity I can, what it is which maketh any Synod to bee, or rightly to be eſteemed a generall and lawfull Councell.

2. As the name of *Synod* doth in his primary and large acception agree to every aſſembly, ſo doth the name of Councell to every aſſembly of conſultation: The former being derived from συνίοδος,

is all one with *Cœtus*, and imports the assembly of any multitude which meeteth and commeth together: The later being derived of *Cilia* [a], (whence also *supercilium*) imports the common or joynt intending, or bending their eyes, both of body and minde, to the investigation of the truth in that matter, which is proposed in their assembly: But both of those words being now drawne from those their large and primitive significations, are by Ecclesiasticall writers, and use of speech, (*penes quem jus est, & norma loquendi*) restrained and appropriated onely to those assemblies of Bishops, and Ecclesiasticall persons, wherein they come together to consult of such matters as concernes either the faith or discipline of the Church. Of these, because some are lawfull, others unlawfull Synods, if we can finde what it is which maketh a generall and lawfull Councell, it will bee easie therby to discerne which are unlawfull Synods, seeing it is vulgarly and truly said, that, *Rectum* is *index sui & obliqui.*

[a] *Concilium dicti à communi intentione, to quod in unum omnes dirigant mentis obtutu: Cilia enim oculorum sunt. Isiod. Mer. in suam Canon. collect.*

3. That a Synod be generall and lawfull, there are three things necessarily, and even essentially required, the want of any one of which is a just barre and exception, why that Synod is either not generall, or not lawfull. The first, which concernes the generalitie, is, that the calling and summons to the Councell be generall and Oecumenicall; so that all Bishops be called, and when they are come, have free accesse to the same Councell, unlesse for some fault of their owne, or some just reason, they ought to bee debarred: For if the calling to any Synod bee out of some parts onely of the Church, and not out of the whole, the judgement also of such a Councell is but partiall, not generall, and the Councell is but particular, not Oecumenicall, seeing some of those who have judicatory power are either omitted, or unjustly excluded from the Synod: The want of this was a just exception taken by the Pope *Iulius*, against that Councell of *Antioch* [b], (wherein *Athanasius* was deposed by the *Arian* faction, and *Gregory* of *Cappadocia* intruded into his See) why it neither was, nor could be esteemed generall, or such as should binde the whole Church, by the decrees made by it; for said *Iulius* [c], they did against the Canons of the Church, Μὴ συντρέξαντες εἰς τὸ σύνοδον ἐκκλησιῶν, *because they did not so much as call him to that Synod*; whereas the Canons of the Church forbid that any decree (which should have power to binde the whole Church) should bee made without the sentence, judgement, and consent of the Bishop of *Rome*, (either attained, or at least sought for.) The Canon which *Iulius* mentioned, might well ordaine, and if there were no such Canon, yet even reason and equity doe teach, that such decrees as concerne the whole Church, and are to binde them all, ought to be made by the helpe, judgement, and advise of them all; according to the rule, *Quod* [d] *omnes tangit, ab omnibus approbari debet.* The wilfull omission of any one Bishop, much more of the Bish. of *Rome*, who then was the chiefe Patriarch in the world, declares the Councell not to be generall, seeing unto it there was onely a partiall, and not a generall summons or calling.

[b] *Extat tom. 1. Conc. pa. 420.*

[c] *Apud Socr. l. 2 ca. 13. et Zozom. lib. 3. ca. 9.*

[d] *Reg. Iuris 29.*

4. As this first condition is required to the generality, so are the other two for the lawfulnesse and order of Synods: For if the Apo-

stles

ſtles rule, *Let* [c] *all things be done decently, and in order*, muſt bee kept in every private and particular Church, how much more in thoſe venerable aſſemblies of Oecumenicall Councels, which are the Armies of God, & of the Angels of all the Churches of God, amõg whom doth, and ought to ſhine gravity, prudence, and all ſacred, and fitting orders, no leſſe than in the cœleſtiall Hierarchy, and in the very preſence of the Majeſty of God. If they bee gathered in Gods name, how can they be other than lawfull and orderly Aſſemblies, ſeeing *God* [f] *is not the God of confuſion* [g], *or diſorder, but of peace in all Churches.* Now the lawfulneſſe and order of Synods, conſiſts partly in their orderly aſſembling, and partly in their orderly government and proceedings, when they are aſſembled; whenſoever the Biſhops of any generall Councell firſt aſſemble together by lawfull authority, and then are ſo governed by lawfull authority alſo; that orderly, lawfull, and due ſynodall proceedings be onely uſed therein, as well in the free and diligent diſcuſſion of the cauſes propoſed, as in the free ſentencing thereof, the ſame is truly and properly to bee called ἔννομος ἐκκλησία [h], *a lawfull Synod:* But if either of theſe conditions be wanting, it becomes unlawfull and diſorderly. If the Biſhops aſſemble together, either not being called, or if called, yet not by ſuch as have right and authority to call them; though this in a large acception may bee called a Synod, that is, an aſſembly of Biſhops, yet becauſe they doe unlawfully & diſorderly aſſemble together, it is in propriety of ſpeech to be termed a Cõventicle, a riotous, tumultuous, & ſeditious aſſembly; even ſuch as that was of *Demetrius* [i], & the other Epheſiãs, who, without calling and order, ἀθρόως, ruſht [k] & run headlong together to uphold the honour of their great *Diana*; which both the Spirit of God condemneth, as a confuſed [l] or diſorderly aſſembly, and the more wiſe among them taxed, as a riotous and ſeditious [m] tumult. If being lawfully called, yet they either want a lawfull Preſident to governe them; or having one, yet want freedome and liberty either in diſcuſſing or giving judgement in the cauſe; ſuch a Synod, though in reſpect of their aſſembling it be lawfull, yet in reſpect of their proceedings and judgment, it is unlawfull, and diſorderly, and therefore in propriety of ſpeech to be termed a conſpiracy, becauſe thoſe men conſpire and band themſelves, as did the Councell [n] of the Prieſts with *Pilate*, by unjuſt and unlawfull meanes to ſuppreſſe the truth, and oppreſſe innocency.

c 1 *Cor.* 14. 40.

f 1 *Cor.* 14. 33.
g ἀκαταστασίας. *tumultuationis, incõpoſiti ſtatus.*

h *Act.* 19. 39.

i *Ib. v.* 24. *et ſeq.*
k *Ibid. v.* 29.
l ἐκκλησία συγκεχυμένη. *v.* 32.
m *Periclitamur argui ſeditionis. v.* 40.

n *Mat.* 26. 59. *& ca.* 27. 2. *& Act.* 4. 27.

5. But unto whõ belongs that right to call general Councels, & whẽ they are called, to ſee orderly & ſynodal proceedings obſerved therein? To whom? to whom elſe but only to thoſe who have Imperiall & Regal authority, whether they be one (as whẽ the Empire was united, & the whole Chriſtiã world ſubject to his authority;) or moe, as it was when the Empire was devided, and ever ſince that great diſſolution of it in the time [o] of *Charles* the great: To them, and them onely, this right to belong, I have in two other bookes, the one concerning the

o *Circa an.* 800.

calling, the other concerning the Presidencie in Councels, at large and clearly demonstrated; & I hold them to be so evident truths, both by the doctrine of Scripture, and by the constant judgement and practice of the Catholike Church, for more than eight hundred yeares after Christ, that if any would reade the Tomes of the Councels, hee had need put out both his eyes, if he will not see this.

p *Rom.* 13. 2, 3.
q *Isa.* 49. 23.
r 1 *Pet.* 2. 2.
s *Numb.* 27. 17. *Psal.* 78. 71, 72.
t *Tam Hebraicè quam in* 70. *Interpr. et apud Hier. legitur* [*ad pascendum Iacob populum suum*] *et* [*pavit eos*] *quod alij vertunt, ad regendum.*
u *Non propriè dicitur pascere alium, qui cibum quacunque ratione ministrat, sed qui procurat et providet alteri cibum, quod est certè Præpositi, et gubernatoris, & Actus Pastoralis non est tantum præbere cibum, sed etiam ducere, &c. Bell. lib.* 1. *de Pont. Rom. ca.* 15. § *Primũ. et* § *Deinde.*
x *John* 21. 15, 17.
y *Cum ei (Petro) dicitur, ad omnes dicitur, Amas me? pasce oves meas. Aug. lib. de ægone Christ. ca.* 30.
z *Ier.* 23. 1, 2. *Ezech.* 34. *per totum, et Act.* 20 28. *et* 1 *Pet.* 5. 2.
a 1 *Pet.* 2. 17.
b *Ibid v.* 30.
c *Rom.* 13. 1.
d *Ibid. v.* 4.
e *Chrys. in ca.* 13. *ad Rom.*

6. To them, and them onely is the sword p given by God, that by it they might maintaine the faith, and use it to the praise of them that doe well, but take vengeance on them that doe evill: *They are the nursing* q *fathers of the Church,* unto whom the care is committed by God, that all his Children, to whom they, next unto God, are fathers, *be fed with the sincere milke* r *of Gods word,* all mixture and poison of heresie and impiety being taken away, and severed from it: They are like *Iosbua* s and *David,* appointed by God to be ποιμένες λαῶν, *the Pastours* t, *even supreme Pastours of the Israel of God,* not indeed to teach and give the food themselves, (which duty belongs to their inferiour servants) yet to performe those wch are the principall & most u proper Pastoral acts & offices, *procurare ac providere alteri cibũ, ducere, reducere, tueri, præesse, regere, castigare; to provide that all the sheepe of Christ have wholesome and convenient food given unto them, to lead them, bring them backe, defend, governe, and chastise them when they will not obey their Pastorall call and command.* None of all which Pastorall duties were it possible for Kings to performe, if for publike tranquillity and instruction of Gods people they might not by their authority assemble a generall Councell of Bishops, and being assembled, if they might not defend and uphold all just and equall, but castigate and keepe away all violent, fraudulent, and unjust proceedings in such Councels.

7. I purposely said *supreme* Pastours; for none is ignorant, that *Peter* x and all the Apostles equally with him, as also all y who either in their Presbyteriall or Episcopall authority succeed unto them (for in their *Apostolicall* none of them had or have any successour) that all these are Pastours z also of Gods flock, but they are all subordinate to the Imperiall Pastours of the people of God, the sheep-hooke is subject to the Scepter, the Crosier to the Imperiall Crowne. Concerning Kings Saint *Peter* gives a generall precept, *Feare God* a, *and honour the King*; which honour he expresly calleth subjection b and obedience in the same Chapter; first wee owe obedience to God, and next God, unto Kings and Emperours. Concerning all others excepting Kings, and such as have Kingly authority, Saint *Paul* gives a like generall precept, *Let* c *every soule be subject to the higher powers,* even to those, who by Gods warrant, and as his Vicegerents, doe beare d the sword: to them every soule ought to be subject; who can except thee from this generality? This is commanded, saith *Chrysostome* e, *Not onely to secular men, but to all, to Monkes, to Priests and Bishops,* the Apostle teacheth them, *ex debito obedire, even in duty to obey Kings and Princes,*

sive

ſive Apoſtolus ſis, ſive Propheta, ſive Euangeliſta, ſive quiſquis tandem fueris; not the Prophets, not the Apoſtles, not the Euangeliſts, not any ſoule is exempt from this ſubjection: and if not *Peter* himſelfe, then certainly not his Vicar, as the Pope [f] cals himſelfe: And this very ſubjection of the Pope, and all Biſhops to the Emperours, to omit *Silveſter*, *Iulius*, *Leo*, and *Gregorie*, Pope *Agatho* in moſt ſubmiſſive manner acknowledgeth almoſt ſeven hundred [g] years after Chriſt, [h] *Omnes nos præſules, veſtri imperij famuli*; *All we Biſhops are the ſervants of your imperiall highneſſe*, ſaith *Agatho*, and a Synod of 125 Weſterne Biſhops with him; to which purpoſe hee cals *Italy* his ſervile [i] Province, and *Rome* his ſervile City; adding, that he did this at the Emperours ſacred command, *pro obedientiæ ſatisfactione, pro obedientia quam debuimus*, *for that obedience which hee did owe to the Emperour*; nay, yet in more lowly manner, he ſaith not, that hee, but, *ſtudioſa obedientia noſtri famulatus implevit*; *the willing obedience of his owne ſervitude to the Emperour, did performe this*. Nor was this the profeſſion onely of *Agatho*; and the Weſterne Biſhops, but the whole ſixt Councell approved the ſame, *Petrus* [k] *per Agathonem loquebatur*, *Saint Peter ſpake by the mouth of Agatho*. Now becauſe they all acknowledge the Pope to be the firſt and chiefe Biſhop in the Church, (for they all in that Councell approve [l] the Councels of *Chalcedon*, and firſt *Conſtantinopolitane*, in both [m] wch that is decreed) ſeeing by the confeſſion of *Agatho*, by them approved, the Pope is a ſervant, and oweth ſubjection and obedience to the Emperour; much more are all other Biſhops in the whole world, ſervants, and ſubjects to the Imperial command, and that by the conſenting judgment of the whole catholike Church, repreſented in that ſixt generall Councell.

f *Quem Primatem diœceſeos Synodus dixit, præter Apoſtoli primi Vicarium.* *Nich. 1. Epiſt. 8.* § *Quem.*

g *Conc. 6. habitum an. 680 Bar. et Bin.*

h *Conc. 6. Act. 4. pa. 22. in Epiſt. Agathonis et Rom. Synodi.*

i *Epiſt. Agath. Act. 4. pa. 12. b.*

k *Sermo acclamatorius Conc. generalis 6. Act. 18. pa. 89. b.*

l *Definit. Concil. 6. Act. 17. pa. 80. a.*

m *Conc. 2. Can. 5 et conc. Chal. Act. 16. poſt Can. 27.*

8. The ſame Soveraignty, and ſupreme Paſtorall authority of Kings, is after this againe teſtified in that which they call the eighth generall Councell, more than [n] eight hundred and ſixty yeares after CHRIST. *Baſilius* the Emperour ſaid before the Councell, in his letters [o] unto them, *The government of the Eccleſiaſticall ſhip is by the Divine Providence committed unto us: in that ſhip doth ſaile all who are members of the Church, Biſhops or Laicks, and the government of the whole ſhip is given to the Emperour*; *Hee, like the Pilot, rules and directs all.* *Raderus* the Ieſuite, and *Binius* following him, in ſtead of *nobis* have put *vobis* in the latine text; as if *Baſilius* had ſaid, that the government of the Church belonged to Biſhops, not to Emperours: It is a Ieſuiticall and fraudulent tricke, for which no colour of excuſe can bee made: The Greeke ſet on the very oppoſite Page [p], is ἡμῖν, *nobis*: in the *Surian* Collectiõ [q] of thoſe Acts, it was rightly read *nobis*; their owne Cardinall *Cuſanus* [r] out of the ancient Acts of that Synod, cites it, *commiſiſſet nobis*: the very ſenſe inforceth it to be *nobis*, for the Emperour addeth, *Therefore doe wee with all ſollicitude exhort and warne you, that you come to the holy Oecumenicall Synod*: which had beene a moſt fooliſh collection, had he not ſaid *nobis*, but *vobis*, for then not

n *Conc. illud 8. habit. an. 869. Bar. et Bin.*

o *Conc. 8. Act. 1. pa. 880. b.*

p *Apud Rad. pa. 224.*

q *Extat apud Bin. to. 3. Con. pa. 858.*

r *Cuſan. lib. 3. de Concor. Cath. ca. 19.*

to

to him, but to them ſhould have belonged the care to call the Biſhops to the Synod; yet againſt all theſe evidences of truth *Raderus* and *Binius* falſifie the text, corrupt the words, and pervert the ſenſe, by turning *nobis* into *vobis*, that ſo they might deprive the Emperour of that ſupreme authority which *Baſilius* there profeſſed to belong unto himſelfe, and the Legates of the Patriarchs, in the name of the whole Synod approved the Emperours ſaying [f], *Recte Imperatores noſtri monuere, the Emperours have ſaid well.* To goe no further in this matter, that which was cited out of the Scripture concerning *Ioſhua* and *David*, doth clear this point; for ſeeing all who ſit in Imperial thrones, are like *Ioſhua* and *David*, to feed the Iſrael of God; and the Iſrael of God containes the whole flocke and all the ſheepe of Chriſt, *ex* [t] *hac ipſa voce Paſce, difficile non eſt demonſtrare ſummam poteſtatem ei attribui; It is eaſie even by this very word Feed, to demonſtrate, that ſupreme power doth belong to Kings, ſeeing unto them it is ſaid, Feed my ſheepe, feed my people:* Wherefore ſeeing Kings are commanded by God to rule by their Paſtorall authoritie all others, and all others are commanded to obey, and bee ſubject unto them and their Imperiall commands, as unto their ſupreme Paſtour here upon earth; it hence unavoydably followeth, that Biſhops neither without that Imperiall command, may in a riotous manner aſſemble in generall Councels, nor being commanded by them, may deny to aſſemble, nor being aſſembled may refuſe to bee ordered and governed by their Imperiall Preſidency.

f *Conc. 8. Act. 1. pa. 880. b.*

t *Bell. lib. 1. de Pontif. Rom. ca. 15. § At nobis.*

9. After theſe precepts of GOD, looke to the practice of the Church, and you ſhall ſee that lawfull Synods or Aſſemblies about Eccleſiaſticall affaires, have beene gathered by no other than Imperiall authority, as well in the old as new Teſtament. In the time of IOSIA when the Temple was purged from thoſe manifold Idolatries, wherewith it was polluted, who aſſembled Iſrael? the Prieſts? no, but *the King* [u] *ſent and gathered all the Elders of Iuda, and went into the houſe of the LORD with the Prieſts and Levites:* The like had ASA done in the oath of *Aſſociation, He* [x] *gathered all Iuda:* SALOMON in the *Dedication* of the Temple, *He* [y] *aſſembled the Elders and the heads of the Tribes;* DAVID in bringing the Arke, and in ordering the offices of the Temple, DAVID [z] *gathered all Iſrael together; Hee* [a] *gathered together then all the Princes, with the Prieſts and Levites:* HEZECHIA in clenſing the houſe of the Lord, [b] *Hee gathered the Prieſts and Levites, called* [c] *them his ſonnes;* and they were gathered together, *juxta* [d] *mandatum Regis, according to the commandement of the King. Ioſhua* at the renewing of the Covenant, *He* [e] *aſſembled all the Tribes of Iſrael.* And to mention no more, (for what King is there, or Iudge, or Captaine, who had all kingly authoritie, though ſomewhat qualified and tempered in them more than in Kings) who is not an example hereof? Conſider but *Moſes*, who was the firſt that had ſoveraignty in their common-wealth; how often and ſtill with a warrant from God did he aſſemble the people upon urgēt occaſions?

u 2 *Chr.* 34. 29. 30.
x 2 *Chron.* 15. 9, 10.
y 2 *Chron.* 5. 2.
z 1 *Chron.* 13. 5. & *cap.* 15. 4.
a 1 *Chron.* 23. 2.
b 2 *Chron.* 29. 4.
c *Ibid.* v. 11.
d *Ibid.* v. 15.
e *Ioſh.* 24. 2.

At

At the first making of the covenant with God, *Moses called* [f] *the Elders; at the publishing of the law, Moses brought* [g] *the people out of their tents unto God:* after the bringing of the two Tables from God, *Moses assembled all* [h] *the congregation of Israel:* at the anointing and investing of *Aaron, Moses* [i] *assembled all the congregation:* at the repeating of the Covenant, *he* [k] *commanded all the Elders of the Tribes of Israel to come unto him.* Yea at the very first time, when God appointed him to be a Captaine and Ruler over his people, even then God gave unto him that authority (which afterwards he renewed in the tenth [l] of *Numbers*) to congregate and assemble the people of God; *Goe,* saith God [m], *and gather the Elders of Israel together:* thereby teaching the power of assembling Gods people to be inseparably annexed unto Imperiall, regall, and soveraigne authority; that none hath the one who hath not the other by the very warrant of God committed unto him, to the end the assemblies of Gods people might not be tumultuous and seditious, as was that of *Demetrius*, and of *Corah* [n], *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, which the Lord severely revenged, but lawfull and orderly, as God is the author not of confusion, but of order in all Churches, and in all ages of the Church.

f Exod. 19.7.
g Exod. 19.17.
h Exod. 35.1.
i Levit. 8.3,4.
k Deut. 5.1. & ca. 31.28.
l Num. 10.2. Make thee two Trumpets, that thou maist use them for the assembling of the congregation.
m Exod. 3.16.
n Num. 16.2. &c.

10. Come we to the times of the Gospell. The power and rightfull authority to call Synods was ever in the Emperours and Kings, even in those three hundred years while the Church was in most grievous persecution under Heathen Emperours: The right and power was in the Heathen as well as in Christian Emperours; in *Tiberius* as well as *Theodosius*; in *Diocletian*, as well as in *Constantine* or *Iustinian*. But that power which they rightly had, they did not use aright: not to call Synods to maintaine the faith, but to abolish Synods, Bishops, Christians, and utterly extirpate the Christian faith. Now because Christ had layd an absolute necessity [o] upon the Apostles, and their successors, to feed, to teach, and maintaine the doctrine of faith; and seeing they could not doe this with the allowance, or so much as connivence of the Emperours, who in duty should have protected them in so doing, yea have caused them so to doe; this very necessity enforced them, and was a lawfull warrant unto them, both to feed the flocke, preach the Gospell, and to hold Synods in the best and most convenient manner that they then could, not onely without, but against the will and command of the Emperors, that higher command of Christ over-ruling theirs. Whereby are warranted as lawfull, to say nothing of that Acts 15. those Synods at *Antioch* against *Paulus Samosatenus* at *Rome*, against the *Novatians* in *Africke*, many in the time of *Cyprian*, and divers the like. For even the law of God, to yeeld unto necessity, the example of *David* [p], the doctrine of our Saviour, doth demonstrate; besides those many Maximes, which are all grounded on this truth, as, that necessity [q] hath no law, nor is subject to any law, but is a law of it selfe: that many things are lawfull in case of necessity [r], which otherwise are unlawfull: that of *Leo*, *Inculpabile judicandum quod necessitas intulit*; that is blamelesse which necessity doth warrant: and many the like, which Pope *Iohn* [t] alledgeth. This, and nothing else, doth declare those Synods to have beene lawfull, though assem-

o 1 Cor. 9.16. Matth. 28.19.
p Matth. 12. 1,2. &c.
q *Necessitas non habet legem, sed ipsa sibi facit legem. Caus. 1. q. 1 ca. 39. Remissionem.*
r *Gloss. in cap. Discipulos de consec. distinct. 5. in marg.*
s *Citatur a Io. Damasc. 8. in Epist. 190. S. Not.*
t *Ibidem.*

assembled without Imperiall authority: as the times were extraordinary, so their extraordinary assembling was by those times of necessity made lawfull. But as soone as Emperours began to professe the faith, and to use their owne, and Imperiall authority, in assembling Bishops for consulting about causes of faith, the Catholike Bishops knowing that from thence that law of Necessity was now expired and out of date, attempted not then to come to Synods uncalled, nor refused to come when they were called; though sometimes they came with an assured expectance of the crowne of Martyrdome before they departed; as in the Councels of *Millane*, *Arimine*, and *Syrmium*, called by the Arrian Emperour *Constantius*, is most cleare.

11. Hence it is that all the ancient generall Councels, yea all that were held for the space of a thousand yeares after Christ, were all assembled by no other than this Imperiall authority. Take a short view of some, and of the chiefe of them. Of the first *Nicen*, *Eusebius* [l] saith, *Constantine* assembled this Oecumenicall Councell, hee called the Bishops by his letters, and his call was mandatory, for *Mandatum erat*, ἐπίταγμα *ad hanc rem, Constantine commanded that they should come.* The very Synod it selfe writeth thus in their Synodall letters, *We are assembled* [m] *by the grace of God, & mandato Imperatoris, and by the mandate of Constantine the Emperour:* so *Christopherson* translates συναγαγόντος ἡμᾶς Κωνσταντίνου, both in *Socrates* and *Theodoret*. Of the second, their owne Synodall Epistle to *Theodosius* witnesseth; *We came* [n] *hither, ex mandato tuæ pietatis, by the command of your Imperiall highnesse.* Of the third Councell, the Synodall acts and Epistles are cleare witnesses: *Your Highnes hath cõmanded* [o] *by your holy Edict, the Bishops out of the whole world to come to Ephesus.* Againe, the synod [p] being assembled ἐκ διατάγματος, by the Edict, decree, authority and appointment of the Emperour: and the like is repeated I think not so little as threescore times in those Acts. And as they came at the Emperors command, so would they not depart without his leave and licence. *We beseech* [q] *your piety that you will at length free us from this exile:* and the Emperour granted their request: for, *injungit* [r] *eis, he commanded & injoyned them* to returne to their owne Cities: and againe, *Regio* [s] *mandato imperatum est singulis Episcopis*, there was a mandate to all the Bishops by the Emperour to returne to their owne Provinces. Of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, the whole Synod saith in their Epistle to Pope *Leo*, This [t] holy and generall Synod was assembled by the grace of God, *& sanctione Imperatorum, and by the sanction or decree of our most holy Emperours.* Againe, this synod was gathered, *ex decreto* [u] *Imperatorum, by the decree of the Emperours: secundum jussionem, according to his command.* And the like is repeated almost in every action. Of the fift we shewed before that it was called *Iussione* [x] *piissimi Imperatoris, by the command of the most holy Emperour Iustinian.* Of the sixt it is usually said, it was assembled, *secundum* [y] *Imperialem sanctionem aut decretum*, and the like, by the Imperiall sanction or decree. And the whole Councell in their prosphoneticall oration to the Emperour, saith [z] unto him; *your mansuetude hath congregated this holy and great assembly.* Of their second Nicene it is said, that it was assembled, *per* [a] *pium Decretum, Sanctionem, Mandatum,*

l *Euseb. lib. 3. de vit. Constant. c. 6*

m *Citantur verba, tum a Socr. lib. 2. ca. 6. tum a Theodor. lib. 1. ca. 11.*

n *Epist. Synod. Conc. Const. 1. apud Bin. to. 1. Conc. pa. 518.*

o *ἐνισχεῖ διατάγματι παρὰ βασιλέως τοῦ. Iussit suo pio edict. Act. Conc. Epheso. to. 4. ca. 11.*

p *Act. Conc. Ephes. to. 2. ca. 1.*

q *Epist. Synodi ad Imper. to. 2. Act. Conc. Eph. ca. 17.*

r *ἐκέλευσεν. to. 5. Act. Conc. Eph. ca 11.*

s *ἐκέλευσεν. ibid.*

t *Epist. Syn. Chalc. post Act. 16.*

u *Conc. Chalc. Act. 1. pa. 1.*

x *Conc. 5. Coll. 8. pa. 584. a.*

y *Conc. 6. Act. 1. 2. 3. & reliqui.*

z *Conc. 6. Act. 18 pa. 89. a.*

a *Conc. Nic. 2. Act. 1. pa. 297. a & act. 2 pa. 308 b. & act. 5. pa. 338. b.*

datum, by the holy Decree, Sanction, and Mandate of the Emperors: of that which they call the eighth, the ſynodall definition expreſſeth, *Quod à* [b] *Baſilio Imperatore coactum, that it was aſſembled by Baſilius the Emperour*; and the whole Synod cryed out, We all thinke ſo; we all ſubſcribe to theſe things. And Pope *Stephen* in his letters to *Baſilius*, ſpeaking of this Synod, ſaith [c], Did not the Romane See ſend Legates to the Councell, ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτοκρατείας σου, *te imperante*, *Raderus* and *Binius* tranſlate it, but it is rather to be read, *ad imperium*, and *ſummam juſſionem tuam*, the Pope ſent Legates, not when *Baſilius* was Emperour, (which was no great honour or token of duty to be done:) but at the moſt high command of *Baſilius*; which teſtified his ſubjection and duty to the Emperour, whom the Pope in that ſame Epiſtle acknowledgeth to be the higheſt [d] perſon who here upon earth ſuſtaines the perſon of Chriſt: and in the ſixt Action of the ſame [e] Councell, it is ſaid, *Imperator hanc Synodum coegit, the Emperour aſſembled this Synod.*

b *Conc. 8. Act. 10. pa. 897. a.*

c *Epiſt. Stephan. poſt Conc. 8. pa. 900.*

d *Quamvis ſupremam Chriſti in terris perſonam formamq; geris. Steph. Ep. eadem. p. 899. b.*

e *Conc. 8. act. 6. pa. 886. a.*

12. Thus all thoſe Councells which are uſually reckoned for generall and approved, for the ſpace of a thouſand yeares, were all called by Imperiall juſſion and command; the religious Emperours exerciſing that right in commanding all Biſhops, even the Popes to ſuch Councels; all the Biſhops, even the Popes, by their willing obedience acknowledging that authority and power to be in the Emperours, and therefore they gladly obeyed thoſe imperiall juſſions and commands. And as they were all aſſembled by Imperiall calling, ſo were they all governed by Imperiall preſidency. That *Conſtantine* was Preſident in the *Nicene*, Pope *Stephen* in the Epiſtle lately cited expreſly witneſſeth: *Doe you not remember*, ſaith he [f], *what Pope Silveſter ſaid in the Nicene Synod, præſidente ibi S. Conſtantino, Saint Conſtantine being Preſident therein.* His owne Acts in the Councell, of moderating [g], and repreſſing the jarres of the Biſhops, of burning [h] their bookes of accuſations and quarrels, of drawing them to unity, that with one conſent they ſhould define the cauſes propoſed, doe manifeſt the ſame: *for all theſe are acts of the Imperiall preſidency.* That *Theodoſius* was Preſident in the ſecond, may appeare, not onely for that he was preſent [i] therein, and preſent no doubt as *Conſtantine* had beene before, as a moderator of their actions; but that ſmall remainder of the Acts of that Councell import alſo the ſame: for he directed, and that by his *Mandatum* [k], what the Biſhops ſhould doe: and when they out of their partiall affections would have preferred each his owne friend to the See of *Conſtantinople*, the Emperour perceiving that, corrected their partiall judgement, *Juſſit* [l] *inſcribere chartæ, hee commanded them to write a bill of ſuch men as they thought fit for the place*; himſelfe nominated *Nectarius*; and though many of the Biſhops at firſt contradicted that choice, yet he drew them all to his ſentence, and ſo the whole Synod conſented upon the ordination of *Nectarius.*

f *Steph. Papa in Epiſt. ad Baſil. Imper. poſt 8. Conc.*

g *Euſeb. lib. 3. de vit. Conſt. ca. 13.*

h *Ruff. lib. 1. c. 2.*

i *Ipſoq; præſente Theodoſio. Epiſt. Juſtin. poſt Conc. 5. pa. 605. a.*

k *Inſuperq; mandavit Imperator, ut diligens inquiſitio fieret. Sozom. lib. 7. c. 6.*

l *Sozom. lib. 7. ca. 7.*

13. For the holy Epheſine Synod, all the Acts are full of this Imperiall Preſidency. *The Emperours ſent Candidianus* [m] *to keepe away tumult, and diſorderly* [n] *perſons from the Councell: to ſee that no* [o] *diſſention and private quarrels might hinder their grave conſultations, the free and exact diſcuſſion of the cauſes propoſed, and to provide that every one might free-*

m *Tom. 1. acti Conc. Epheſ. ca. 32.*

n *Non licet illos qui neceſſarij non ſunt, dogmatum examen aliquo tumultu impedire. ibid.*

o *Vt diligenter proſpiciat ne qua gravior diſſentio ſynodi conſultationem obturbet. ibid.*

freely [p] *and with leiſure propoſe what was needfull, and have ſcope to refute all doubts propoſed by others.* The Emperours when they heard of the diſſentions and diſorders among the Biſhops, writ unto them to take a better and more peaceable and orderly examination of the cauſe, ſaying [q], *Majeſtas noſtra ea quæ acta ſunt pro ratis & legitimis habere non poteſt; our Majeſty cannot hold or eſteeme thoſe acts, done ſo diſorderly, for firme and ſynodall*; nay we decree that all things which hitherto have beene done, *pro irritis, & nullis habenda eſſe, ſhall be accounted of no force, but utterly void and fruſtrate*: than which no greater tokens of Imperiall Preſidency can be deviſed. The whole and holy Synod willingly ſubmitted themſelves to this preſidency. In their proceedings the Emperours letters were their direction [r], and as themſelves profeſſe, the very Torch to guide all their actions. In the manifold injuries and contumelies which they endured at the hands of *Iohn*, with his Conventicle, they fled to the Emperour, beſeeching [s] him to be Iudge of their equall proceedings, and take an exact view and examination of their doings, which upon [t] their requeſt the Emperour did, and called [u] five Biſhops of either part to *Conſtantinople* to declare the whole cauſe unto him; after which being performed, he gave judgement [x] for the holy Councell, and adnulled all the acts of the Conventicle, as the holy Synod had earneſtly and humbly entreated him. So fully and cleerly doth that ſacred and Oecumenicall Councell, wherein was the judgement and conſent of the whole Catholike Church, both acknowledge this Imperiall right of Preſidency in the Emperours, and ſubmit themſelves unto it.

14. For the Councell of Chalcedon, the matter is ſo evident, that *Bellarmine*, though ſtrugling againſt the truth, could not deny it. *There were preſent*, ſaith he [y], *in this Councell ſecular Iudges, deputed by the Emperour, who were not Iudges of controverſies of faith*, (to give a deciſive ſuffrage therein, for that belongs to no ſecular man whatſoever) *ſed tantum an omnia fierent legitime, ſive vi & fraude & tumultibus, but they were Iudges onely of Synodall order, whether all things were done lawfully, without force, fraud and tumult.* And in this doth the very Imperiall Preſidency conſiſt. And truly how religiouſly and worthily thoſe glorious Iudges performed that honourable office in the ſynod, all the actions thereof doe make manifeſt: for ſcarce any matter was done in the ſynod, but the ſame was ordered, moderated, and guided by their prudence and authority. The Popes Legats very inſolently took upon them at the beginning, willing that *Dioſcorus* might bee put out of the ſynod, and ſayd [z], *Either let Dioſcorus goe out, or we will depart.* The Iudges gravely reproved this ſtomacke in the Legates, telling them, *If you will be* [a] *Iudges, you muſt not proſequute as accuſers*: nor did they ſuffer *Dioſcorus* to goe away, but commanded him, as was fit, to ſit in the place of the *Rei*. The cauſe of *Iuvenalis* and *Thalaſſius* was propoſed to the ſynod; It could not be examined by them, till they had leave from the Emperour; *We*, ſaid [b] the Iudges, *have acquainted the*

[p] *Vt omnibus & ſingulis rectè percepiis, ſinguli quod viſum fuerit, in medio proponant, vel ab aliis propoſita, ſi opus id fuerit, refutare. ibid.*

[q] *Sacr. Imper. ad Synodum, to. 3. act. Conc. Eph. ca. 17.*

[r] *Primo omniũ Actorum monumentis reverendas pietatis veſtræ literas quaſi Facem quandam præmiſimus. Ep. ſynod. ad Imp. to. 2. act. Conc. Eph. ca. 22*

[s] *Etiam atque etiam rogamus veſtram Majeſtatem ut ſanct. ſynod. ſtudium erga Deum agnoſcat, ut Candidianum & quinque præterea è ſacra ſynodo Epiſcopos adſe accerſat, qui omnia & ſingula quæ Epheſi geſta ſunt pietati veſtræ ordine & coram exponant. Epiſt. ſynodi ad Imp. to. 4. act. Conc. Eph. ca. 10. & idem ca. 11.*

[t] *Annuit tandẽ illorum votis Imperator. Bin. in arg. cap. 19 to. 4. act. Conc. Epheſ.*

[u] *Veſtra pietas noſtra ſupplicatione inflexa mandavit, ut S. Synodus quos voluerit amãd et qui univerſarum rerum ſtatum coram exponant. Relat. ſynodi ad Imper. to. 4. act. Conc. Epheſ. c. 22*

Noſtræ preces ſunt ut judicium à tua pietate accipiamus. Iohan. & convent. cum expetit. ad Imper. Append. ad to. 2. Act. Conc. Epheſ. ca. 2. pa. 787. b. [x] *Decretum regium, to. 5 act. Conc. Epheſ. ca. 11.* [y] *Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 19. §. Quartam.* [z] *Act. 1. Conc. Chal. pa. 4. b. Aut ille egrediatur, aut nos eximus.* [a] *Si Judicũ obtines perſonam, non ut accuſator debes proſequi. Ibid. pa. 5. b.* [b] *Act. 4. Conc. Chal. pa. 89. b.*

Emperour therewith, and we expect his Mandate herein: and after they had received the Emperours minde, they then told the synod, *Imperator* [c] *sententia vestra permisit de Iuvenale deliberare, the Emperour hath upon your intreaty permitted you to discusse and judge the cause of Iuvenalis Thalassius, and the rest.* In the cause [d] of the ten Ægyptian Bish. the Synod had almost pronounced a temerarious sentence against them, as heretically, when indeed they were orthodoxall; the Bishops cryed out, *Isti heretici sunt*, these ten are heretikes. The glorious Iudges knowing which was manifest, that they forbore to subscribe, by reason of a custome which they had, that they might doe nothing without their Patriarke, who was not then chosen; and not as thinking heretically in the faith, moderated the Synod in that matter, saying, [e] *Rationabile nobis & clemens videtur; it seemes to us to be reason, and an act of clemencie, not to have condemned them, but staid till their Patriarch bee chosen*: the whole Synod consented to this grave sentence of Iudges, and made a Canon [f] for that purpose. In making the very definition of faith, there grew a great dissention in the Synod; some [g] would have it one, some another way set downe; in so much that the Popes Legates were ready to make a schisme, and depart [h] from the Councel, and hold another Councell by themselves. The glorious Iudges proposed a most equall and fitting meanes to have the matter peaceably debated, and the whole Synod brought to unity: But when out-cryes [i] and tumult prevailed above reason, the Iudges complained of those discords to the Emperour, and, *Imperator* [k] *præcepit, the Emperour commanded them to follow the direction of the Iudges*, which they did, and so with one accord consented on the Definition of faith. The Emperour at the [l] earnest entreaty of *Bassianus*, commanded [m] the Synod to examine the whole cause betwixt him and *Stephanus*, to which of them in right the See of *Ephesus* belonged; The Synod would have given sentence for *Bassianus*, *Iustitia* [n] *Bassianum vocat, Equity and right doth call for Bassianus to bee the Bishop of that place*. The glorious Iudges weighing the cause more circumspectly, thought that neither of them both could in right be Bishop: The whole Synod being directed by them, altered their opinion, and said [o], This is a just sentence, this is the very jugement of God. When there was a difference in the Synod, about the dignity of *Constantinople*, the greater part [p] holding one way, and the Popes Legates the contrary [p], the glorious Iudges judicially [q] sentenced, which was to stand for the Iudgement of the Synod; and the whole Councell in their synodall letter consented [r] therunto. So many, so manifest evidences there are of the Imperiall Presidency in that holy Councell, not any of all those Catholikes once repining at, or contradicting the same.

15. For the fift, that it was ordered by the Imperiall authoritie, may appeare, in that both the Emperor was sometimes by [s] himselfe, sometimes by his glorious [t] Iudges, present in the Synod, and specially in that hee tooke order, that liberty [u] and synodall freedome should be observed therein; yea, as the whole Synod testifieth, hee did [x] *omnia*, all things which preserve the peace of the Church, and unity in the Catholike faith: The sixt Councell is abundant with prooses of

c *Ibid.*
d *Act.4. Conc. Chal. pa.90. Omnes clamaverũt, Isti hæretici sunt*
e *Act. eadem 5. pa.90 b.*
f *Can.30. Act.15*
g *Non recte habet Definitio, &c. Act.5. Cõc. Chal. pa.93.b.*
h *Iubete nobis rescriptum dari ut revertamur, et ibi Synodus celebretur. Ibid.*
i *Suggerentur Imperatori clamores isti, &c. Act. eadem. 5. pa.94.a.*
k *Ibid.*
l *Festinet vestra reverentia causam discutere, &c. Litera Imper. Act.11. Cõc. Chal. pa.116. b.*
m *Act. eadem pa.118.b.*
n *Ibid.*
o *Hæc omnes dicimus. Act.16. pa.137.a.*
p *Contradictio nostra his gestis inhæreat. Ibid.*
q *Quod interloquuti sumus tota Synodus approbavit, dixerunt Iudices. Ib.*
r *Confirmavimus regulam 150. patrum, &c. Relatio Synodi ad Leonem post Conc. Chal. pa.140.a.*
s *Cũ Iustinianus Synodo interfuit. Zonar. Annot. 3. in Iustin. t Coll.1. Conc.5. et Coll.7.*
u *Maximè, cum piissimus Imperator et nos ipsi licentiam dedimus unicuique suam voluntatem facere manifestã, sic dixit Synodus. Coll.2. pa.524.b.*
x *Coll.7. p.581.b*

this presidency: *Macarius* said, O our most holy Lord, *iubeto*[y] *libros proferri, command that the bookes bee produced*; and the Emperour answered, *Iubemus, we command them to be brought*; wee command them to be read; and it was done. The Popes Legates say, *Petimus*[z] *serenitatem vestram, we entreate your highnesse* that this booke may be examined; the Emperour answered, *Quod postulatum est proveniat, let that be done which you request*: Againe, O most holy Lord, we intreat[a], *that the letters of Pope Agatho may be read*; the Emperours answer was, what you have desired, let it be done; and they were read: *Macarius* having collected certaine testimonies out of the Fathers, for his opinon, intreated the Emperour, *Iubeto*[b] *relegi, that he would command them to be read*; his answere was, let them bee read in order, and so they were: The Popes Legates said, *petimus*, wee intreate[c] your highnesse, that the authentike Copies may bee produced out of the Registrie; his answer was, *fiat, let it de done*: The whole Synod intreated, If it[d] please your piety, let *Theodorus* and the rest, stand in the midst, and there make answer for themselves; his answer was, What the Synod hath moved, *fiat, let it be done*: *George* Bish. of *Constantinople* said, O our Lord, crowned by God, command * that the name of Pope *Vitalianus* may bee set in the Dipticks; his answer was, *quod postulatum est, fiat, let that be done which he hath requested*. The Emperour commanded[e] the bookes of *Macarius* to be read; the whole Synod answered, *Quod jussum est, what your highnesse hath commanded shall be performed*. After the authenticall letters of *Sergius*, & Pope *Honorius* had been read in the Synod, the glorious Iudges called[f] for the like authenticall writings of *Pirrhus*, *Paulus*, *Peter*, and *Cyrus*, to bee produced and read: the whole Councell answered[g], that it was superfluous, seeing their heresie was manifest to all: the Iudges replied, *omnino*[h] *necessarium existit, this is necessary*; that they be convicted out of their owne writings; and then their writings were produced. I omit the rest, whereof every Action of that Synod is ful; and by those Acts the Presidency in Councels doth so clearly belõg to Emperors, and that also by the acknowledgment[i] of that whole generall Councell, that *Albertus Pighius* being unwilling to yeeld to this truth, hath purposely writ[k] a most railing and reviling Treatise against this holy generall Synod, condemning both this Councell, and these Acts, as unlawfull, for this among other reasons, because the Emperour with his Iudges, *plena*[l] *authoritate Præsidet, is President with full authority in the same*; hee doth all, he proposeth, hee questioneth, he commandeth, hee examineth, he judgeth, he decreeth: And yet in all these hee doth nothing but what belongs essentially to his Imperiall authority; nothing but what *Constantine*, *Theodosius*, *Martian*, and *Iustinian* had done before him, and done it with the approbation and applause of the whole Church, and of all the Catholike Bishops in those holy generall Councels; and hee performed this with such uprightnesse and equality, that hee professed, *necessitatem*[m] *nullatenus inferre volumus*, wee will inforce no man, but leave him at his owne freedome in sentencing the causes proposed, and, *æqualitatem*[n] *utriusque partis conservabimus; we will bee equall and indifferent Iudges betwixt both parties.*

y *Conc. 6. Act. 1 pa. 8. b.*

z *Act. 3. Conc. 6. pa. 11. a.*

a *Ibid. pa. 11. b.*

b *Act. 5. pa. 25. b*

c *Act. 6. pa. 27 a*

d *Act. 8. pa. 30. a*

* *Ibid.*

e *Act. eadem 8. pa. 30. b.*

f *Act. 13. pa 67. a. b.*

g *Sanctum Concilium dixit, Hoc fieri superfluum judicavimus, &c. Ibid. pa. 67. b.*

h *Ibid.*

i *Præsidente eodem pyssimo Imperatore Constantino. Act. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 11.*

k *Act. Pigh. lib. de Actis 6. et 7. Synodi quæ circumferuntur, quod parengrapha sint et minimè germana.*

l *Lib. eodem*

§ *At Concilio illi*

m *Sacra Imp. Constantini Pogon. ante 6. Conc. pa. 6. b.*

n *Ibid.*

16. In

16. In the ſecond Nicene, though by the fraud of *Anaſtaſius* there be not many, yet are there ſome prints remaining of this Imperiall Preſidencie; *We have received*, ſay the Emperours [o], *letters from Hadrian Biſh. of Rome, ſent by his Legates, qui et nobiſcum in Concilio ſedent, who alſo ſit with us in the Synod:* Thoſe letters, *jubemus publicè legi, we command to be publikely read according to the uſe in Councels*, and we command all you to marke them with decent ſilence: After that, you ſhall reade two quaternions alſo ſent from the Biſhops in the Eaſt; and the whole Synod obeyed the Imperiall commands. Pope *Hadrian* himſelfe was not ignorant of this right in the Emperours, when ſending his Pontificall and *Cathedrall* judgement concerning the cauſe of Images, hee ſaid thus unto them, *We* [p] *offer theſe things to your highneſſe with all humility, that they may bee diligently examined, for we have but perfunctoriè, that is, for faſhiõ, and not exactly gathered theſe teſtimonies, and we have delivered them to your Imperiall Highneſſe to be read, intreating and beſeeching your manſuetude; yea, and as if I were lying* [q] *at your feete, I pray and adjure you that you will command holy Images to bee reſtored.* Thus hee. When the Pope cals the Emperours his [r] Lords, and ſubmits both his owne perſon to their feet, and his judiciall ſentence to ſuch tryall, as they ſhall thinke fit, doth not this import an higher Preſidency in the Emperour, than either himſelfe or his Legates had in the Synod? Nay, it is further to be remembred, which will remaine as an eternal blot of that Synod, that *Irene* the Empreſſe, not contenting her ſelfe with the Imperiall, which was her owne rightfull authority, intruded her ſelfe into the Epiſcopall alſo; ſhe forſooth would be a [s] Doctrix in the Councell; ſhe preſent among the Biſhops to teach the whole Councell what they ſhould define in cauſes of faith: *Perverſas Conſtitutiones tradere; ſhee tooke upon her to give Conſtitutions*, and thoſe impious alſo, unto them: Thoſe Conſtitutions backed with her ſword and authority; the Biſhops of the Councell had not the hearts and courage to withſtand: All which is teſtified in the *Libri Carolini*, which in part were written [t], and wholly ſet forth by *Charles* the great, being for the moſt part compoſed by the Councell at *Frankfourd* [u], and approved by them all in that great ſynod. A truth ſo cleare, that Pope *Adrian* in his reply to thoſe Caroline bookes, denyeth not *Irene* to have done this, (which had eaſily and evidently refuted that objectiõ, and diſcredited thoſe Caroline Bookes for ever) but hee [x] defends her fact by the examples of *Helena* and *Pulcheria*, to which this of *Irene* is ſo unlike, that for this very cauſe ſhe is by the whole Councell of *Frankford* [y], conſiſting of three hundred Biſhops, or thereabouts, reſembled to the tyrannizing and uſurping *Athalia*. Laſtly, when that whole Synod came to the Kingly City for the Imperiall confirmation of their Acts, ſeeing it is expreſly teſtified by *Zonaras* [z], and *Paulus Diaconus* [a], that the Emperour was Preſident in that aſſembly of the Biſhops, why ſhould it not by like reaſon be thought, that both himſelfe when hee was preſent, and in his abſence the ſecular Iudges, his Deputies, held the ſame Imperial Preſidency in the Nicene Synod?

o *Conc. Nic. 2. Act. 1. pa. 300.*

p *Epiſt. Hadr. Papa ad Imp. lecta in Con. Nic. 2. Act. 2. in fine Epiſt.*

q *Et veluti præſentes genibus advoluti, et cordi veſtigia pedum volutando. Ibid.*

r *Dominus piiſſimis Conſtantino et Irene Hadrianus ſervus ſervorum Dei. Inſcript. Ep. Hadr.*

s *Synodus illa (Nicena) mulierem Inſtitutricẽ ſive Doctricem habuiſſe perhibetur; quod non ſolum divina legis documentis, ſed ipſius naturæ lege inhibetur. Car. magni liber dict. Capitular. de imag. adnand. Imag. lib. 3. ca. 13. Aliud eſt matremfamilias domeſticos erudire; aliud Antiſtitibus ſine omni Eccleſiaſtico ordine, vel publicæ Synodo docentem intereſſe. Ibid.*

t *Quod quia aggreſſi ſumus cum cõhibẽtia Sacerdotum, non arrogantiæ ſupercilio, ſed zelo Dei et veritatis ſtudio. Carol. mag. præfatio, et Cap. ultimum illius libri fuiſſe Caroli agnoſcit Had. in ſua Epiſt. 3. ca. 25. pa. 281. a.*

u *Libri Carolini ſcripti videntur in Concilio Francofordienſi. Bell. lib. 2. de Conc. ca. 8. § Primo quia.*

x *Hadr. Epiſt. 3. 3. ca. 53.*

y *Lib. Carol. lib. 3. ca. 23.*

z *Commentaria in regia Preſidentibus Imperatoribus recitarunt, quæ ſtatim obſignata ſunt. Zonar. to. 3. in vita Iren. et Conſt.*

a *Ingreſſi ſunt omnes Epiſcopi in regiam, et in præſidentibus Imperatoribus una cum Epiſcopis, lectus eſt tomus, et ſubſcripſit tam Imperator, quam mater ejus. Paul. Diac. hiſtor. miſc. lib. 23. in ex. 9. Conſt.*

17. For that which they call the eighth generall Councell, both the Emperours Deputies are called Presidents[i]; and in the sixt, seventh, eighth, and tenth actions it is expresly said, *Presidentibus Imperatoribus, the Emperours being Presidents*; yea, and both of them by their very actions declared their Presidencie. The Popes Legate[k] would not have permitted *Photius* and his Bishops to bee heard; the Emperours Deputies over-ruled[l] them, as was fit, in that matter; yea, they said to the Photian Bishops, *Imperator*[m] *jubet et vult, the Emperours will, pleasure, and command is, that you should speake in your owne cause.* Of the Emperour they intreat liberty to defend themselves, *Rogamus domine*[n] *Imperator; we beseech you, our Lord and Emperour, that without interruption we may defend our cause:* When the bookes of *Photius* were brought into the Synod, and burned in the midst thereof, this was done, κελεύσαντος Βασιλέως[o], *the Emperour commanding it*, and many the like.

18. Now these eight are all which are accounted by them in the number of generall and approved Councels, for the space of more than a thousand years after Christ: Of al which seeing it is now cleare, that they were both called by Imperiall authoritie, and governed by Imperiall Presidencie, it hence appeareth, that as by the warrant of the Scriptures, and example of the ancient Church before Christ, so also by the continued practice of the whole Catholike Church, for a thousand years together; these rights of calling and ordering generall Councels doe belong, and were acknowledged to belong onely to Kings and Emperours; they called and commanded the Bishops, the Bishops came at that call and command: they governed the assemblies in those Councels, all the Bishops (without murmuring or so much as once contradicting) willingly submitted themselves to that Imperiall government. And by this may now easily be discerned wherein the lawfulnesse or unlawfulnesse of any Synod consisteth: For whereſoever to Imperiall calling, and Imperiall Presidencie, there is added the rightfull use of that Imperiall authoritie, in seeing liberty, freedome, diligent discussion of the causes, and all due synodall order preserved in any generall Synod, the same is, and ought to bee truly called a generall lawfull Councell: But what generall Councels soever have beene heretofore, or shall bee at any time hereafter, either assembled by any other than Imperiall, and regall authority, or governed for the observing of synodall order, by any other than Imperiall Presidencie, or misgoverned by the abuse thereof, they all are, and are to bee esteemed for no other than generall unlawfull Councels.

19. Suffer mee here to propose some examples of each kinde, partly in the ancient, partly in the later times of the Church: In the order of lawfull generall Councels, principally, and by a certaine excellency above all the rest, are the five first approved Councels to bee reckned: The first at *Nice*, the second at *Constantinople*, the third at *Ephesus*, the fourth at *Chalcedon*, the fift at *Constantinople* in the time of *Iustinian*; unto these the *Sardicane*, and that at *Constantinople* under *Mennas*, are to bee added, like two Appendant Synods; the former to that at *Nice*, the later to that at *Chalcedon*: For the sixt, which was held

i *Magnificentissimi præsides dixerunt Act.9. § Lecta.*
k *Repugnantibus Apostolicis legatis, utpote quod sententia Rom. Pontificum condemnati audiri iterum non deberent. Bar. an. 869. nu. 27.*
l *Advocentur cum Photio Episcopi quoque Photiani, quod nisi fiat, literam in hac Synodo scribemus nullam. Verba Iudic. sec. in Cõc. 8 Act. 4. pa. 883. b*
m *Verba Babanis in Conc. 8. citata à Nicb. Cusan. lib. 3. Concor. ca. 20.*
n *Conc. 8. Act. 6. verba sunt Metropolitæ Cæsariensis, pa. 886. b*
o *Act. 8. p. 893. a*

held at *Conſtantinople* in the time of *Conſtantinus Pogonatus*, I am out of doubt, and doe firmely hold it to have beene both generall and lawfull: But I mention it apart by reaſon of that ſcruple touching the Canons thereof, concerning which I intend, if ever I have oportunity, to make a ſeverall tract by it ſelfe. For their ſecond *Nicene*, and the next unto it, to wit, that at *Conſtantinople*, in the time of *Baſilius* and *Hadrian* the ſecond; beſides that there are juſt exceptions againſt their lawfulneſſe, in regard of the proceedings uſed therin, it may be juſtly doubted whether either of them may be eſteemed generall: ſpecially conſidering that the Councell at *Frankford* utterly condemned [p] that ſecond *Nicene*, and decreed that it ſhould not bee called a generall Synod: and in very like manner did the Councell at *Conſtantinople*, held in the time of Pope *Iohn* the eighth, (or as ſome call him the ninth,) the next ſucceſſor to *Hadrian* the ſecond, condemne [q] that Councell which they call the eighth, held in the time of *Hadrian* the ſecond. Now although by the judgements of theſe two Councels, thoſe other which they reckon for the ſeventh and eighth be wholy repealed, and that moſt juſtly; yet if the authority of theſe Synods were omitted, there are ſo many and ſo juſt exceptions againſt the two former, that I am out of doubt perſwaded, that neither of them ought to ſtand in the order of generall lawfull Councels: nor will any, I ſuppoſe, judge otherwiſe, who ſhall unpartially examine the Acts of them, & compare them with the hiſtories of theſe times. If any at all after the ſixt be to be ranked in the number of generall and lawfull Councells, I would not doubt to make it evident, if ever I ſhould proceed ſo farre in this argument about Councels, that the Councell held at *Conſtantinople* in the time of *Conſtantinus Iconomachus* (whom they in contempt have with no ſmall token of their immodeſty nicknamed *Copronimus*) that this ought to bee judged the ſeventh; that at *Frankford* the eighth; and that at *Conſtantinople*, which even now I mentioned, held in the time of Pope *Iohn* the eighth, (or as ſome call him, the ninth) the ninth of that order. For both the generality of all theſe three is by the beſt Writers acknowledged, and all of them were called by Imperiall authority, governed by Imperiall preſidency, and that in a lawfull, free, and ſynodall manner; as, if ever I come to handle the Councels of thoſe times, I purpoſe to explaine. This rather for this time I thinke needfull to obſerve: that as a Councell may be generall, and yet not lawfull, ſo may one be both generall and lawfull, and yet erroneous in the decrees thereof: which one point rightly obſerved, ſhewes an exceeding difference betwixt thoſe five firſt generall Councels, with the *Sardicane*, and that under *Mennas*, and all the reſt which follow the fift Synod. The former which were all held within the ſix hundred yeares after Chriſt, in the golden ages of the Church, are wholly, and in every decree and Canon, orthodoxall, and golden Councells, no droſſe, nor dramme of corrupt doctrine could prevaile in any one of them: and ſo they are, and ever ſince they were held, were eſteemed not onely generall and lawfull, but in every part and parcell of their decrees, holy and orthodoxall Councels, approved by all Catholikes, and by the whole Ca-

[p] *Synodus quæ ante paucos annos ſub Irene & Conſtantino congregata, & ab ipſis non ſolum ſeptima verũ etiã univerſalis erat appellata ut nec ſeptima nec univerſalis haberetur, dicereturve, quaſi ſupervacua in totum ab omnibus (in Conc. Francofordenſ) abdicata eſt. Aim. lib. 4. ca. 85. Similia habet Ado Vien. in Chron. Hincm. Rhem. in lib. contra Hincm. Land. ca 20. Rhegino, Hermann. Strabus Fuld. Egolif. Monac. & alii quam multi.*

[q] *Quartus Canon (Concilii) Conſtant. ſub Iohan 8 ſuperiores ſynodos adverſus Photinũ habitas Nicholai & Hadriani temporibus explodit, & rejicit imõ ut de Synodorum numero tollantur jubet. Fran. Turrian. lib. de 6, 7, & 8. ſynod. pa. 95.*

tholike Church. But in all generall Councels which follow that fift, which were held after the 600. yeare, and in thoſe times wherein droſs and corruption began to prevaile above the gold, in them all there is ſome one blot or other wherewith they are blemiſhed, and by reaſon whereof, although they be both generall and lawfull, yet are they not in every decree holy and orthodoxall, nor approved by the ſucceeding ages of the Church. Such in the ſixt, is the 2. 52. and 53. Canons: in that under *Conſtantinus Iconomachus*, the 15. and 17. definitions: in that at *Frankford*, their condemning of the fact of the *Iconoclaſts*, which (untill the decree for breaking them downe was repealed by the Councell at *Frankford*) was both pious, and warranted by the example of *Hezekias* dealing with the brazen ſerpent: In that under *Iohn* the 8. their denying of the holy Ghoſt to proceed from the Son: And theſe examples which I have now named, are all the examples of generall and lawfull Councels, which as yet have beene held in the Church.

20. Wee come now to unlawfull Synods: wherein it is very memorable, that of ſuch as are unlawfull by want of lawfull calling, there is no example in the ancient Church to bee found, nor more than a thouſand yeares after Chriſt. All that time not any generall Councell aſſembled without lawfull warrant. The Biſhops, no not they of Rome, were as yet growne to bee ſo inſolent and headſtrong as to come together without the Emperours *Mandatum*. And the very like might be ſaid of ſuch Synods as are unlawfull by want of Imperiall preſidency. During all that time no Biſhop, no not he of *Rome*, durſt intrude himſelfe into that Royalty and Imperiall right. As the Emperour called them all for a thouſand yeares, ſo was he by himſelfe or his deputies Preſident in them all. But of ſuch as were unlawfull by abuſe of that Imperiall preſidency, thoſe ancient times doe yeeld abundant examples. Such among many was that at *Millane*, wherein *Conſtantius*, who ſhould have preſerved order in all others, moſt of all in his owne ſelfe uſed ſuch violent and tyrannous dealing, that the only Canon [r] whereby he ruled the Synod, was his owne will: *Quod ego volo pro Canone ſit*; *My will ſhall be your law*: and the onely reaſon whereby hee perſwaded, was a moſt tyrannous *Dilemma*, *Aut ſubſcribite* [t], *aut exulate*; *either ſubſcribe to Arianiſme, or goe into baniſhment*. Such againe was that Epheſine Latrocinie; When *Dioſcorus* could not otherwiſe prevaile, hee brought [t] the Proconſull guarded with clubs, with ſwords, with chaines, and by ſuch meanes forced the Biſhops to ſubſcribe to blankes [u], and to the hereſie of *Eutiches*; ſuch fraud, violence, and unjuſt proceedings, whereby all liberty was taken away, made that Synod, though lawfully called, and having a rightfull Preſident, to be no other than a very Latrocinie [x], as it is uſually and [y] juſtly called. Of this ſame ſort was the Councel at *Arimine*, at *Syrmium*, and divers more of the ancient Synods. But theſe are ſufficient for examples in thoſe ancient times: the unlawfulneſſe of them all ariſing onely from the abuſe of the Imperiall and lawfull authority, not for want of lawfull authority either to aſſemble them, or governe them being aſſembled.

r *Athan. in Epiſt. ad ſolit. vit. agent. pa. 228. b.*

t *Ibid.*

t *Introduxerunt proconſulem cũ multitudine magna, & catenis. Act. Conc. Epheſ. in Conc. Chalc. Act. 1. pa. 39. a. Violenta facta eſt vis, cum plagis. Minabatur nobis damnatio, minæ exilij tendebantur, milites cum fuſtibus & gladiis inſtabant. ibid. Act. 1. pa. 7. b.*

u *In pura charta ſubſcripſimus. ibid. pa. 7. b.*

x *Vbi gladii & fuſtes, qualis ſynodus? ibid.*

y *Aliud Epheſi Concilium latronum cogitur. Epiſt. Iuſtin. ad 5. ſynod. p. 605. b*

21. Let

21. Let us come lower, and to later times, and then we ſhall have abundance of examples of all kindes of unlawfull Synods. Since the thouſand yeare after Chriſt, there have beene ten which they honour with the ſpecious titles of generall [z] and holy Councels. All of them held in the Weſt, five at *Rome* in the *Laterane*; three in *France*, (two of them at *Lions*, the third at *Vienna*;) two in *Italy*, the one at *Florence*, the other, which is the laſt and worſt of all, at [a] *Trent*. For their generality it is not unknowne what juſt exceptions may bee taken againſt them. Seeing in foure [b] of them none, in the reſt but very few of the Eaſterne Biſhops were preſent, they ought rather to bee called partiall, than generall; Weſterne, than Oecumenicall Synods. That the Greekes held them not for generall, both that ſpeech of theirs in the Councell of *Florence* [c], *Venio ad ſeptimum & ultimum generale Concilium*: where they profeſſe the ſecond Nicene to be the laſt which they acknowledge for a generall Councell: and the words of *Bellarmine* do make evident; *Græci* [d] *tantum recipiunt prima ſeptem Concilia ut notum eſt*; *It is a thing vulgarly knowne, that the Greeke Church receiveth none but the ſeven firſt for generall Councells.* And yet if wee ſhould admit them (as we may not) for generall, what more honor were it for them that they were generall, than for the Councell at *Ariminum*, at *Syrmium*, at *Millane*, and the Epheſine Latrocine: the worſt of all which is by many degrees, for ſanctity and due ſynodall order, to bee preferred before the beſt of their ten. But beſides this of their generality, there is another exception which can never bee removed, concerning their lawfulneſſe. They all and every one of them are unlawfull Synods: and that by defect of all thoſe conditions which are eſſentially required in all lawfull generall Councels.

22. Vnlawfull firſt they are by want of lawfull calling and authoritie to aſſemble them: not one of them aſſembled by Imperiall, all by Papall and uſurped authority. *The Popes*, ſaith *Bellarmine* [e], *have called moe than twelve generall Councels*: Of thoſe, theſe which wee have named were ten. Of the firſt Laterane, which is the firſt of the ten, *Binius* [f] ſaith, *It was appointed, ſolius Pontificis authoritate, by the authority of the Pope alone.* Of the next, which was the ſecond Laterane, wherein were preſent about a thouſand Biſhops, *It was Innocentius* [g] *will to congregate it.* Of the third at Laterane (which is alſo the third in order) *It was aſſembled, Papæ authoritate* [h], *by the authority of Pope Alexander.* Of the fourth Laterane, (the fourth alſo in order) wherein among many other like matters, Tranſubſtantiation was firſt of all decreed, more than twelve hundred yeares after Chriſt, *Authoritate* [i] *Innocentij indicta eſſe indicat apertiſſime Encyclica epiſtola, the Encyclicall Epiſtle doth moſt manifeſtly ſhew that it was appointed by the Popes authority.* Of the fifth, which was the former at *Lions*, This Synod was appointed and congregated, *A* [k] *ſolo Pontifice, by the Pope alone, and by his authority.* Of the ſixt, which was the ſecond at *Lions*, Pope *Gregory Indixit* [l] *hoc Concilium, appointed this Councell.* Of the ſeventh, which was at *Vienna*, Pope *Clement* [m] *indixit Concilium, appointed this Councell.* Of the *Florentine*, which is the eighth, This Synod was *ab* [n] *Eugenio indicta, appointed*

z Bin. *in tomis ſuis Concil. & Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 5. & alij.*

a *Tridentum nõ Germanicam eſſe, ſed Italicam civitatem nemo eſt qui neſciat. Gravan. oppoſ. Conc. Trident. pa. 36.*

b *Omitto quinq; alia Concilia generalia, quia nec à Græcis recipiuntur, cum ipſi non interfuerint, — nimirum Lugdunenſe ſub Innocent. 4. Viennenſe ſub Clemente 5. Conſtantienſe, Lateranenſe ſub Leone 10. & Tridentinum. Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 13. § Deniq;.*

c *Concil. Flor. Seſſ. 5. p. 421. & Sunt autem verba Marci Epheſii, præclari Theologi, qui pro Græcis cauſam egit. ut liquet ex ſeſſ. 3. pa. 415 b.*

d *Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 5. § Ex his.*

e *Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 13 § Ad hæc.*

f *Bin. Not. in Conc. Lateran 1. § Concilium. to. 3. pa. 1317. a.*

g *Quibus de cauſis Pontifex hanc Synodum congregatam voluerit, intelliges. Bin. Not. in Conc. Later. 2. pa. 1325. a.*

h *Bin. Not. in id. Conc. pa. 1350. b.*

i *Bin. Not. in Conc. Lateran. 4. pa. 1465. b.*

k *Bin. Not. in Conc. Lugd. 1. to. 3. pa. 1490. a.*

l *Bin. Not. in Conc. 2. Lugdun. (ex Blond.) p. 1495. a.*

m *Bin. (ex Tritem.) Not. in Conc. Vien. to. 3. Conc. pa. 1510. a.*

n *Bin. Not. in Conc. Florent. to. 4. pa. 495. b.*

pointed by Eugenius, at the intreaty of the Emperour. Of the ninth, which was the fift *Laterane*, This was appointed and aſſembled, *Authoritate* [o] *Iulij Papæ, by the authority of Pope Iulius*: nor onely was it ſelfe ſo aſſembled, but it [p] decreed (which was never done before) that all generall Councels ought to be ſo aſſembled. For the laſt (which is their faire *Helen* [q] of *Trent*) the Popes Bull, whereby hee appointed, ſummoned, and aſſembled it, is ſet in the forefront of it; wherein the Pope ſaith, *Conventum* [r] *Mantuæ indiximus, we have appointed that this Councell ſhould bee held at Mantua*; but afterwards he removed it to *Trent*.

o Bin. Notis in Con. Later. 1. ſub Leone 10. to. 4. Conc. pa. 651.
p Conc. Later. ſub Leone 10. Seſſ. 11. p. 639. b
q Hæc eſt Helena, quæ nuper Tridenti obtinuit. Eſpenc. com. in Epiſt. ad Tit. pa. 42.
r Pauli 3. Bulla indict. præfixa Act. Conc. Trid.

23. Thus were all the ten aſſembled by Papall, not one of them by Imperiall authority. For though ſome Emperours and Kings conſented indeed unto ſome of them; as to the firſt *Laterane*, *Henry* 5. to that at *Vienna*, *Philip* of *France*, and ſo in ſome others; yet the conſent of Emperours and Kings is not ſufficient for holding a Councell, the authority by which the Biſhops are called and come together, muſt bee regall: which in all theſe, as *Bellarmine* [s] truly teacheth, was onely pontificial. Againe, that very conſent to hold thoſe Councels which Kings then gave, was a ſervile conſent, not Imperiall; nor was it free and willing, but coacted and extorted. They knew certainly by the dealing of Pope *Hildebrand* with *Henry* the fourth, what they might expect, if they withſtood the Popes will, or wraſtled with ſuch a Giant: no leſſe than the loſſe of their Crownes had beene the cenſure for denying to conſent to what the Pope would have them: their conſent was no other, but that by the Popes authority the Synod ſhould bee called and held, a conſent that the Synod ſhould be called by an unlawfull and uſurped authority; even ſuch a conſent, as if a rightfull King being overcome by a Rebell, ſhould for feare of his life conſent that the Rebell ſhould call and aſſemble a Parliament, and there enact what lawes himſelfe liſted. It is the authority by which thoſe Councels were gathered, not by whoſe conſent they were gathered; of which we doe now enquire. The authority whereby they were aſſembled was onely in the Pope, though to that authority Emperours and Kings conſented: and as they are not a little brag that the Pope could doe ſuch worthy acts by his authority; ſo are we ſo farre from denying him to have done this, that wee willingly profeſſe the ſame: but withall doe affirme, which inevitably enſues thereof, that even for this very cauſe all thoſe Councels are unlawfull, becauſe they were called by Papall, and not by Imperiall authority. This demonſtrates them to have aſſembled without lawfull authority, to have beene nothing elſe than ſo many great Routs and Riots in the Church, ſo many tumultuous and diſorderly Conventicles, ſo much more odious both in the ſight of God and men, as thoſe who tumultuouſly and without authority convented, ſhould have beene patternes of piety, obedience, and order unto others.

s Cur tunc non ſolus Pontifex concilia indixerit, ut poſtea factum eſt, rationes multæ ſunt. Bell. lib. 1. de Concil. ca. 13. §. Habemus.

24. Yea and this very exception which may equally be oppoſed againſt them all, was moſt juſtly taken (to omit the reſt) againſt their *Trent* Riot, when it was congregated by that Papall and uſurped authority. The King [t] of England gave this as a reaſon of his refuſall to ſend

t Imoc. Gentil. in Examin. Con. Trid. lib. 2. in initio.

ſend to it, becauſe the right to call Councels belonged to Kings and Emperours, *nullam vero eſſe poteſtatem penes Pontificem*, but the Pope had no authority to call or aſſemble a Councell. The French King writ a letter to them at *Trent*, and the ſuperſcription [u] was, *Conventui Tridentino*: The Fathers ſtormed and ſnuffed a long while at that, diſdaining that the King ſhould write *Conventui*, and not *Concilio*, and hardly were they perſwaded to read his letter: At laſt, when credence and audience was obtained for *Iames Aimiot* his Legate, he ſignified before all the *Trent* Fathers, that the King proteſted and publiſhed to al, (as alſo before he had done at *Rome*) that he accounted not that aſſembly *pro Oecumenico & legitimo Concilio, ſed pro privato Conventu; not for a generall Councell, but for a private Convent*, gathered together for the private benefit and good of ſome few; adding, *ſe ſuoſque ſubditos nullo vinculo ad parendum his quæ in eo decreta fuerint obſtrictos iri; that hee and his ſubjects would not be tyed by the decrees thereof:* exhorting further that this his proteſtation might bee recorded among the Acts of their Synod, and that all Chriſtian Kings might have notice thereof. The Electours [x] and Princes of *Germany* being aſſembled at *Nurimberge*, when *Zacharias Delphinus*, and *Franciſcus Commendonius* the Popes Legates came to warne them in the Popes name [y] to come, or ſend to the Councell of *Trent*, returned this anſwere unto them, *Mirantur illuſtriſſimi Electores & Principes, the moſt illuſtrious Electours and Princes doe wonder, that the Pope would take upon him, Celſitudinibus ſuis Concilij indictionem obtrudere, to obtrude to their Celſitude his appointment of a Councell*, and that he durſt call them to *Trent*; adding, wee would have both the Pope and you his Legates to know, that wee acknowledge no ſuch authority in the Pope, and we are certainly perſwaded by the undoubted teſtimonies both of Gods law and mans, *Concilij indicendi jus Pontificem Romanum non habere; that the Pope hath no authority and right to appoint, call, or aſſemble a Councell.* Thus they; whoſe anſwer is at large explaned in their *Gravamina* [z], where the firſt reaſon of their rejecting the *Trent* aſſembly is this, *quod ea illegitime, & contra manifeſtum jus indicta ſit; becauſe it was appointed and gathered unlawfully, & againſt manifeſt right*, ſeeing the Pope who called it, hath no authoritie to ſummon or call a Councel: Of the ſame judgement were other Princes. When *Hieronimus Martinengus* [a] was ſent as Legate from the Pope, to call ſome out of England to that *Trent* aſſembly in the time of the late Queene of renowned and bleſſed memory; *è Belgio in inſulam traijcere prohibuit; ſhe would not ſuffer him to ſet foote in her dominion about ſuch buſineſſe: Nec* [b] *diverſum ad Reges Daciæ & Suetiæ miſſus, reſponſum retulit; and the Kings of Denmarke and Swetia gave the like anſwere, that the Pope had no right to call a Councell.* So juſtly did they diſlike and contemne the going to that Synod, even for this cauſe, and that moſt juſtly, eſteeming it for no other than a Conventicle, or unlawfull aſſembly.

u *Gent. in Exam. ſeſſ. 12. Cõc. Trid. pa. 96. & Iob. Sleid. Comment. lib. 22. pa. 332. b. et ſeq.*

x *Epit. rerum in orbe geſt. ſub Ferd. 1. an. 1561. apud Scard. tom. 3. pa. 2171. et ſeq.*

y *Summus Pontifex ſacrum Concilium Tridenti celebrandi authoritate divinitus ſibi tradita decrevit; noſq; ablegavit nuncios ſuos qui ſy Pontificis nomine ſingulos convenirem us, et rogarémus ut ad Concilium hoc accederent. Ibid.*

z *Gravam. oppoſita Conc. Trid. Cauſa 1. pa. 21.*

a *Epit. rerum in orb. geſt. ſub Fer. an. 1561. apud Scard. loc. cit.*

b *Ibid.*

25. Said I unlawfull? that is too ſoft and mild a word: that, and all the other nine with it, by reaſon of that Papall calling, were unlawfull in the higheſt degree, even Antichriſtian: For the authoritie whereby thoſe Synods were called, belonging in right to Emperours and

and Kings, and being tyrannically uſurped by the Pope, as he by intruding himſelfe into the Imperiall royalties, and lifting up himſelfe above all the Vicegerents of God here in earth, *that is, above* [c] *all that is called God*, did thereby proclame himſelfe to bee that man of ſinne, and diſplay his Antichriſtian Banner: So on the other ſide, thoſe Biſhops and others, who came at his Papall call, and yeelded obedience to him, in ſuch ſort uſurping, did, *eo ipſo*, in that very act of theirs, receive the marke of the beaſt, and not onely conſent, but ſubmit themſelves to his Antichriſtian authority, and fight under the vety Enſignes and Banner of Antichriſt: But of this point I have before [d] intreated, where I ſhewed, that all, even the beſt actions, (how much more then ſuch tumultuous and turbulent attempts) when they are performed in obedience to the Pope, as Pope, that is, as a ſupreme Commander, are turned into impious and Antichriſtian rebellions againſt God.

[c] 2 Theſſ. 2. 4.

[d] Sup. ca. 13.

26. This rather is needfull to bee here obſerved, that not onely generall, but even Provinciall or Nationall Synods are in all Chriſtian Kingdomes to bee called onely by Imperiall, not at all by Papall or Epiſcopall authority; yea, and they are ſo called in every well ordered Church: For although there goe not forth a particular and expreſſe *Edict* or *mandatum* from Kings, to aſſemble them, yet ſo long as Kings or Emperours doe not expreſſe their will to the contrary, even that ſummons which is ſent from Primates or other Biſhops ſubject unto them, hath virtually and *implicitè* the Imperiall authority by wch every ſuch Synod is aſſembled: The reaſon whereof is this: The holy Nicene Councell decreed [e], that for the more peaceable government of each Church, there ſhould be two Provinciall Synods yearely held by every Primate. Thoſe holy Fathers meant not (as the continuall practice throughout the whole Church doth explane) ſo ſtrictly to define that number of two, as that neither moe, nor fewer might be kept in one yeare: But they judging that, for thoſe times a competent and convenient number, they ſet it downe, but yet as an accidentall, ceremoniall, and therefore mutable order, if the neceſſitie and occaſions of any Church ſhould otherwiſe require. That which is ſubſtantiall and inmutable in their Canon is, that Provinciall Synods ſhall be held by each Primate ſo often, and at ſuch times as the neceſſity and occaſions of their Church ſhall require: and the chiefe Iudge of that neceſſity and fitting occaſions is no other than hee to whoſe ſword and authority every Biſhop is ſubject, and without whoſe conſent firſt obtained, they may in no place of his Kingdome aſſemble together without the note of tumult and ſedition. This Nicene Canon, as all the reſt, when *Conſtantine* [f], and other ſuceeding Emperours and Kings approved, (as who hath not approved that holy Councel?) they then gave unto it the force of an Imperiall law, according to the rule, *omnia* [g] *noſtra facimus, quibus noſtram impartimur authoritatem; wee make that our owne Act, and our law which wee ratifie by our authoritie*: And *Iuſtinian* more plainly expreſſed this, when he ſaid: [h] *Sancimus vicem legum obtinere ſanctas regulas; we enact, that the holy Canons of the Church* ſet downe in the former Councels, the *Nicene*, the *Conſtantinopolitane*,

[e] *Placuit annis ſingulis per unamquamq; Provinciam bis in anno Concilia celebrari. Conc. Nic. Can. 5.*

[f] *Quæ ab Epiſcopis erant edita regulæ Conſtantinus ſua confirmabat et confirmabat authoritate. Euſeb. lib. 4. de vita Conſt. ca. 27.*

[g] *Lib. 1. Cod. de Veter. jure enuc. et lib. 2. Decretal. tit 23. ca. ſicut noxius in Gloſſa.*

[h] *Novel. 131. ca. 1.*

politane, Epheſine, and *Chalcedon,* ſhall have the force, and ſtand in the ſtrength of Imperiall lawes: By this Imperiall aſſent it is, that when the wiſedome of Chriſtian Emperours and Kings doth not otherwiſe diſpoſe of calling Synods in their dominions, Primates may call the ſame, two, or moe, or fewer in any yeare, as neceſſitie ſhall perſwade: but whenſoever they call any, the ſame are called, aſſembled and celebrated by the force of that Imperial authoritie, which Kings and Emperours have either given to that Nicene Canon, or which they in more explicite manner ſhall impart unto the Primates or Biſhops in their Kingdomes.

27. Now if Provinciall Councels may not, nor ever are lawfully held in Chriſtian Kingdomes without this authority, how much leſſe may generall and Oecumenicall, the occaſions of which being rare and extraordinary, the calling alſo of them is extraordinary, and both for the time & place, meerly arbitrary, at the will of thoſe who have Imperial or regal authority: To ſay nothing, how inconvenient it is even in civill government, and how dangerous unto Chriſtian States, that all the Biſh. of a Kingdome ſhould leave their own Churches naked of their guides, and Paſtours, and goe into farre and forraigne Countries, without the command of their Soveraigne Lords, eſpecially goe at the command of an uſurping Commander, and that alſo, if he require, though their owne Soveraignes ſhall forbid or withſtand the ſame, of the miſchiefe and danger whereof the example of *Becket*, among many like, may be a warning to all Kingdomes. But leaving that to the grave conſideration of others, thus much now out of that which hath beene ſaid, is evident; that ſeeing all thoſe ten forenamed Synods were called and aſſemble by no other authority than Pontificall, and ſeeing lawfully aſſemble they could not, but onely by Imperiall, it hence clearly enſueth, that for defect of lawfull calling and aſſembling, they are all of them no other than unlawfull Councels: Againe, ſeeing no Synods are congregated in Chriſts name [i], but ſuch as are aſſembled by him who hath from Chriſt authority to aſſemble them, which in Chriſtian Kingdomes none hath, as wee have ſhewed, but onely Kings and Emperours: and ſeeing none of thoſe ten were aſſembled by them, it hence further and certainly enſueth, that never one of thoſe ten were gathered in Chriſts name, and if not in Chriſts, then ſure in no other but in the name of Antichriſt, and ſo all of them, in reſpect of their calling, not only unlawfull, but even Antichriſtian Councels.

28. After their calling conſider their proceedings, for as thoſe Councels were unlawfully aſſembled, ſo were they alſo unlawfull by defect of the other eſſentiall condition, which is, due and ſynodall order: for they all not onely wanted ſynodall freedome and order, but, which is worſe, they wanted that which is the onely meanes to have ſynodall freedome and order obſerved in any generall Councell, and that is the Imperiall Preſidencie: in none of them was the Emperour, in them all [k] the Pope was Preſident: In the firſt *Lateran*, *Caliſtius* [l]; in the ſecond, *Innocentius* [m] the ſecond; in the third, *Alexander* [n] the third, in the fourth, *Innocentius* [o] the third; and the like might bee ſhewed

i *Congregari in nomine Chriſti nihil aliud eſt, quam ab eo congregari, qui habet à Chriſto authoritatem congregandi. Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 17. § At hoc. k Addamus (his 8. primis) reliqua generalia Concilia, in quibus omnibus ſine controverſia Pontifex Rom. præſedit. Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 20 § Si ergo.*

l *Papa Calixtus 2. coram innumera multitudine Cleri et populi, eidem Concilio (Viennenſem nominat Viſper. diceret Lateranenſi, ut et Bin. agnoſcit notis ſuis in illud Cōc.) præſedit. Abb. Viſper. ad an. 1119. et hinc Concilio præſedit Pontifex. Bin. notis ſuis ad id Conc. p. 1317. b*

m *Synodus maxima Romæ præſidente ſummo Pontifice Innocētio celebratur. Otho Friſing. lib. 7. ca. 13.*

n *Omnes ſcriptores fatentur eidem Concilio Pontificem Romanum præſedi ſſe. Bin. Not. in Conc. Later. 3. § Oecumenicum to. 3. pa. 1351.*

o *Et Pontifex Rom. præſedit. Bin. not. in Conc. Later. 4. to. 3. Con. pa. 1466. b.*

ſhewed in the reſt; but that *Bellarmines* words may eaſe us of that labour, who ſpeaking of all thoſe ten Councels, ſaith [p], *In eis omnibus ſine Controverſia Pontifex Rom. præſedit*; *the Pope without doubt was Preſident in them all.*

29. Nor was this an Epiſcopall Preſidencie a preheminence only, & precedence before other Biſhops in the Synod, ſuch as any Biſh. to whō the Emp. pleaſed to confer that dignity, might lawfully enjoy, & when he gave it to none by name, it then by his *tacit* conſent or permiſſion fell, as it were by devolution upon the chiefe Biſhop that was preſent in the Councell: Such a Preſidencie, though it bee not due to the Pope, ſeeing in the ancient Councels hee neither had it, nor grudged that other ſhould have it, yet are wee not unwilling to allow that unto him, if contenting himſelfe therewith hee would ſeeke no more: But the Preſidencie which hee now deſires, and in all thoſe ten Councels uſurped, is meerely Imperiall; the Preſidencie of governing the Synod, and ordering it by his authority and power, the very ſame which in all the generall Councels, for a thouſand yeares after Chriſt, the Emperour held, and had it as one of his Royalties and Imperiall rights, none of all the Catholike Biſhops in thoſe Councels ever ſo much as contradicting, much leſſe reſiſting the ſame: For any Biſhops, moſt of all for the Pope, to take upon them ſuch a Preſidencie utterly overthrows all liberty and order in Councels; for by it all the Biſhops are to be kept in awe and order; and the Pope, who of all other is moſt exorbitant, and fartheſt out of ſquare, ought by this to be curbed, & reduced in to order: Even as when *Catiline* took upon him to bee the Ruler and guide to his aſſembly, and a puniſher of diſorders among them, though all the reſt willingly ſubmitted themſelves, and that with a ſolemne oath [q], to bee ordered by him in their actions; yet for all this order they were no free Romane Senate, but a Conjuration of Conſpirators, ſtriving to oppreſſe [r] the Romane State, liberties, and ancient lawes: Right ſo it is in theſe Synods, when the Pope, who is the Lord of miſrule, and Ring-leader of the Conſpirators, takes upon him this Preſidencie, to order Councels, though the reſt not onely conſent, but binde themſelves by a ſacred oath [s], to be ſubject to his authoritie; this very uſurpation of ſuch Preſidencie doth, *eo ipſo*, exclude and baniſh al liberty & ſynodall order, & makes their aſſemblies meere Conjurations againſt the truth, and ancient faith of the Church.

30. How could it now be choſen, but that whaſoever hereſie the Pope with the faction of his Catilinarie Conſpiratours embraced, ſhould in ſuch Councels prevaile againſt the truth? The Imperiall authority was the onely hedge or pale to keepe the Pope within his bounds; that being once removed, he ſaid, he did, he decreed what he liſted. The rule of his Rigiment was now the old Canon of *Conſtantius*, *Quod ego volo pro Canone ſit*: the proofe of all their decrees was borrowed from their predeceſſors, the old *Donatiſts*: *Quod [t] volumus ſanctum eſt.* Not Emperours, not Biſhops, none might controule him or ſay unto him [u], *Domine, cur ita facis?* The Biſhops were tyed to him by an oath [x], to defend the Papacy, (that is, his uſurped authority) and

p *Bell. lib. 1. de Con. ca. 20 § Si ergo.*

q *Hos ut ſe nefando jure juramento adſtringerent, adegit, puerum enim macta vit, juramentoq; intio ſuper ejus viſceribus, eadem ipſe cum alijs eomedit. Dio Caſſ. lib. 37.*

r *Catilinam luxuria primum tū egeſtas in nefaria Concilia opprimendæ patriæ impulerat, Senatum confodere, totam rempub. funditus tollere, et quicquid nec Hannibal. videretur optaſſe. L. Flor. lib. 4. ca. 1.*

s *Ego Nic. ab hac hora fidelis ero S. Petro et Eccleſiæ Romanæ dominoque meo Papæ. Papatum adjutor ero ad defendendum. Forma eſt juramenti ſecundum quam jurant Epiſcopi et bodiè omnes recipientes dignitatem à Papa. Extra. de jure jur. ca. Ego N. lib. 2. tit. 24. ca. 4.*

t *Aug. lib. 2. cōt. Ep. Parm. ca. 13.*

u *Quid excogitare verum vel veriſimile poſſunt, quibus non vel Rex vel Cæſar, non populus, non clerus, non generalis Synodus, non denique tota Eccleſia dicere poteſt, cur ita facis? Cl. Eſpen. in cap. 1. ad Titum. pa. 76.*

x *De quo ſupra cap. Ego N. Extra. de jure jur.*

and defend it, *contra omnes homines*, againſt all that ſhould wag their tongues againſt it. The Emperours and Kings ſaw how *Hildebrand* had uſed, and in moſt indigne manner miſuſed *Henry* the 4. how *Alexander* [y] the third had inſolently trodden on the necke of *Fredericke*: what could they, nay what durſt they doe, but either willingly ſtoop and proſtrate themſelves, or elſe be forced to lye downe at the Popes feet, and ſay unto him, *Tread on us, O thou Lion of the Tribe of Iudah*; and according as it is written, Set thy foot *ſuper Aſpidem & Baſiliſcum*. Could there poſſibly be any freedome or order in ſuch Synods, where the onely meanes of preſerving freedome and order was baniſhed? Might not the Pope in ſuch Councels doe and decree whatſoever either himſelfe, his will, or faction would ſuggeſt unto him? Say they had neither ſwords, nor clubs, nor other like inſtruments of violence in thoſe Synods: they needed none of them: This Papall preſidency was in ſtead of them all. It was like the club of *Hercules*, the very ſhaking of it was able, and did affright all, that none, no not Emperours durſt deale againſt it. The removing of the Imperiall preſidency made ſuch a calme in their Synods, that without reſiſtance, without any need of other further violence, the Pope might overſway whatſoever he deſired.

[y] *Alexander Imperatori juſſit ut ſe humi proſterneret, et Imperatoris collum pede compriment ait, Scriptum eſt, Super Aſpidem et Baſiliſcum ambulabis. Naucl. an. 1177*

31. And truly it may bee eaſily obſerved by ſuch as attentively reade the Eccleſiaſticall ſtories, that together with the ſtanding or fall of the Empire, either the ancient faith or hereſies prevailed in the Church. So long as the Emperour being Chriſtian, retained his dignity and Imperiall authority, no hereſie could long take place, but was by the Synodall judgement of Oecumenicall Councels maturely ſuppreſſed: the faction of no Biſhop, no not of the Pope, being able to prevaile againſt that ſoveraigne remedy. But when once [z] *Gregorie* the ſecond, *Zachary*, and their ſucceeding Popes to *Leo* the third, had by moſt admirable and unexplicable fraud & ſubtilty, clipt the wings and cut the ſinewes of the Eaſterne Empire; themſelves firſt ſeizing upon the greateſt part of *Italy*, by the meanes of *Pipin*; and then erecting a new Empire in the Weſt; the Imperiall authority being thus infringed, the Eaſterne Emperour not daring, the Weſterne in regard of the late curteſie received from the Pope, being not willing, and neither of them both being able now to match and juſtle with the Pope; this which was the great let and impediment to the Popes faction, and the diſcovering of the man of ſinne being now removed, there was no meanes to keepe out of the Church the hereſies which the Pope affected: then the *Cataracts* of hereſies being ſet open, and the depths of the earth, nay of the infernall pit being burſt up, hereſies ruſht in, and came with a ſtrong hand into the Church, and thoſe hereticall doctrines which in ſix hundred yeares and more could never get head, paſſing as doubtfull and private opinions among a few, and falling but as a few little drops of raine, grew now unto ſuch an height and outrage, that they became the publike and decreed doctrines in the Weſterne Church. The Pope once having found his ſtrength in the cauſe of Images, (wherein the firſt triall was made thereof) no fancie nor dotage was ſo abſurd for which he could not after that com-

[z] *Ab an. 730 ad an. 800.*

mand, when he liſted, the judgement of a generall Councell, Tranſubſtantiation, Proper Sacrifice, the Idoll of the Maſſe, (to which not *Moloch* nor *Baal* is to be compared) their Purgatorian fire, their five new-found proper Sacraments, condignity of workes, yea Supererogation, and an armie of like hereſies aſſayled and prevailed againſt the truth. The Imperiall authority being laid in the duſt, and trampled under the ſole of the Popes foot, no meanes was left to reſtraine his enormous deſignes, or hinder him in Councels, to doe and define even what he liſted. And as the Imperiall authority which he ſo long time had oppreſſed, is in any kingdome more or leſſe reſtored, and freed from his vaſſalage; the other hereſies which aroſe from the ruine and decay thereof, are more or leſſe expurged out of that Kingdome, and the ancient truth reſtored therein: Yea and ſtill, though but by inſenſible degrees, ſhall hee and his authority waſt [a] and conſume, till not onely all the ten [b] hornes of the Beaſt (that is, all the Kings whoſe authority he hath uſurped, and uſed as his hornes to puſh at Gods Saints) ſhall hate the Whore, that Romiſh *Babylon*, and make her deſolate and naked, and burne her with fire; but till himſelfe alſo being deſpiſed and contemned of his owne lovers, ſhall together with his adherents be utterly aboliſhed, and caſt into that Lake of Gods wrath.

a 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 8.

b *Apoc.* 17. 12. 16.

32. You ſee now how unlawfull thoſe Synods are by reaſon of the defect of Imperiall preſidency: you will perhaps demand whether by the want thereof there happened any particular diſorder in them, or ought contrary to freedome and ſynodall order: whereunto I might in a word anſwer, that there neither was, nor could there bee ought at all done in any of thoſe ten Synods with freedome and ſynodall order. For though otherwiſe their proceedings had beene never ſo milde, temperate and equall, yet even for that one defect of Imperiall preſidency, and excluding the ſame; whatſoever they did was diſorderly, and they all nothing but ſynods of diſorder. But yet for further ſatisfaction of that queſtion, let us (omitting all the reſt) conſider among very many, ſome few particulars concerning their youngeſt and deareſt baby of *Trent*, was that equall dealing in *Paul* the 3. at the beginning of his *Trent* aſſembly, to conſpire [c] and take ſecret counſell with the Emperour to make warre againſt the Proteſtants, and root them out of the world? The Italian Franciſcan in his Sermon before *Ferdinand*, ſtirring up both him and others to this butchery, *Exere vires tuas*, plucke up your ſpirit and ſtrength, and root out that peſtiferous kinde of men, *nefas enim eſt, for it is unlawfull* to ſuffer them any longer to looke upon the light: neither ſay that you will doe it, it muſt be done even now at this preſent, and without any delay. Thus did he give the watchword, and ſound an alarme to their intended Maſſacre: whereupon there enſued *bellum cruentum & calamitoſum, a bloody and cruell warre againſt the Proteſtants:* concerning which divers of the Princes of *Germanie* ſaid in their Letters to the Emperour, Wee [f] ſhall ſo anſwer that every man may underſtand, both that injury is done to us, and that you doe undertake this warre *Romani Antichriſti & impij Concilij Tridentini impulſu, at the inſtigation*

c *Cum Concilium jam haberi inciperet, Imperator et Pontifex clanculum und, de armis ad Proteſtantes domandos ſuſcipiendis concilium inter ſe inierunt. Gen. Exam. Trident. Conc. ſeſſ. 3. nu. 5 & Iob. Sleid. Comment. lib. 16. an. 1545.*

e *Gent. loc. cit. nu. 6.*

f *Sleid. Comm. lib. 17. an. 1546*

of

of the Romane Antichriſt, and the impious Councell at Trent, that the doctrine of the Goſpell, and the liberty of *Germany* may bee oppreſſed. Was this *Concilium pacis*, or rather *Concilium ſanguinis*, a conſpiracie not onely againſt the faith, but againſt the life of Catholikes? Was it fit his Holineſſe ſhould play *Iudas* part, pretend love and emendation of the faith, when he entended murder, and an utter extirpation of the ſervants of God? Could there be freedome for them at *Trent* in the Popes dominion [g], when they might not be ſuffered to breathe or live at home in their owne free Cities and States? Was not this a ſtratagem unknowne in the time of the Councell at *Millane* and *Arimine*, to invite Catholikes to the Synod, and promiſe liberty and free acceſſe, but provide that they ſhall have no leiſure, not ſo much as come to the Councell?

g *Tridentum libera aut Imperij civitas non eſt, ſed membrum præcipuum Pontificiæ factionis, Grav. oppoſ. Trid Conc. pa. 37.*

33. What equity or freedome could there either be, or be expected in that Councell, wherein the Pope, who is the capitall enemy of the Catholikes, took upon him to be their Iudge, yea, when himſelfe who was *reus*, guilty of hereſie, beſides other crimes, and who ſhould have beene judged firſt of all, tooke upon him to bee ſupreme Iudge in his owne cauſe? Let *Catiline* be held for ſuch a Iudge betwixt the Senate and himſelfe; it is not to bee doubted but *Tully*, and all who ſtood for the liberty of their City and Country, ſhall be proſcribed and condemned as rebels; and *Catiline* with his faction decreed to be the onely true Citizens, the onely men fit to rule the Empire. It was the juſt exception [h] which thoſe 47. Catholike Biſhops that ſtood for *Athanaſius*, tooke againſt the Councell at *Tyre*, wherein hee was condemned, that *Euſebius* and *Theogius*, the mortall enemies of *Athanaſius*, were his Iudges in that Synod; *Lex autem Dei inimicum neque teſtem, neque judicem eſſe vult*; *but the law of God prohibits a mans enemy to be a witneſſe, much more to be his Iudge.* The very ſame exception took [i] *Chryſoſtome* againſt *Theophilus* and the Synod with him. *Theophilus*, ſaith he, *hath called us unto judgement, before hee hath purged himſelfe of the crimes objected againſt him, quod contra omnes Canones & Leges eſt, which is againſt all lawes and Canons:* and againe, it is not fit that *Theophilus* ſhould judge us, *qui ipſe reus eſt, inimicus & hoſtis, who is himſelfe guilty or accuſed of crimes, and is alſo our enemy.* Thus *Chryſoſtome*. A matter of ſuch equity, that both Pope *Nicholas* [k] the firſt, and [l] *Celeſtine* the third ſay, *Ipſa ratio dictat, Common reaſon doth teach, that thoſe who are ones enemies, ought not to be their Iudges.* The Pope then being a profeſſed enemie of Proteſtants can be no lawfull or competent Iudge of them: and being himſelfe *reus*, called into queſtion for hereſies, can be no lawfull Iudge in his owne cauſe, and in thoſe very hereſies whereof he is accuſed. And truly the anſwer whereby *Bellarmine* thought to avoid this moſt juſt exception againſt their *Trent* Councell and the reſt, doth much more confirme the equity thereof: *He confeſſeth that this holds* [m] *in all, ſave onely in the ſupreme Iudge.* He onely may be Iudge in his owne cauſe, and againſt his enemies alſo, all elſe muſt ſtand to the judgement of others. The interpretation is true, but in the application of this to the Pope, there he faileth: for hee intends the Pope to be that ſupreme Iudge; than which there cannot be deviſed a more

h *Athanaſ. Apol. 2. §. Non arbitramur. p. 216*

i *Chryſ. Epiſt. ad Innocent. Papam to. 1. Conc. poſt Epi. Iun. 27.*

k *Quia ſuſpecti et inimici, judices eſſe non debeant, et ipſa ratio dictat et plurimis probatur exemplis. Epiſt. 8. Nich. 1. §. Igitur quia.*

l *Ipſa ratio dictat, quia ſuſpecti et inimici judices eſſe non debeant. Extr. de Appel. ca. Secundo requiris.*

m *Quod dicunt, non debere eundem eſſe Iudicē, et partē, dico habere locum in privatis hominibus, non in principe ſupremo. Ille enim ſemper eſt ſummus Iudex etiamſi cum ipſo litigetur. Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 21. §. Tertiò*

baſe begging of the queſtion, and moſt ſpeciall controverſie. That he is not ſupreme, we unavoydably prove by the words of Chriſt[n], *Dic Eccleſiæ:* by the judgement of this fift Councell, which judged and condemned both the Popes *Cathedrall Conſtitution* for hereticall, and *Vigilius* himſelfe for an heretike: and in ſaying the fift Councell, it is as much as if I ſaid, by the judgement of the whole Catholike Church, all the former Councels conſenting in faith with this fift, and all that follow it approving the judgement thereof, untill their *Laterane* Synod. The ſame is further proved by the ſixt[o] generall Councell, which judged and condemned Pope *Honorius* for an Heretike; by that which they call the ſeventh, which [p] alſo condemned *Honorius*; by the next, which they account the eighth, wherein it is decreed, that in the caſe [q] of hereſie the Pope may be judged; (and that is the very caſe whereof the Pope is now accuſed;) by the Councels of *Conſtance*[r], and *Baſil*[r], *in both which it is decreed to be a doctrine of the Catholike faith, that the Pope hath a ſuperiour Iudge in the caſe both of hereſie, ſchiſme, and ſcandalous life:* by the practice [t] of the Church, in judging and depoſing *Liberius*, and *Iohn* the 12. by the very words of *Bellarmine* himſelfe, *If the Biſhops*, ſaith he [u], *in a Synod can convince the Pope of hereſie, poſſunt eum judicare & deponere, they may judge and depoſe him.* And if in any cauſe he have a ſuperiour Iudge, then is he nor ſupreme. Seeing then by all theſe, beſides infinite moe, it is not onely proved, but demonſtrated, that the Pope is not, nor ought to be held as ſupreme Iudge, but may in ſome cauſes be both judged, condemned, and depoſed: and ſeeing by *Bellarmines* owne confeſſion, none can be judge in his owne cauſe, or of his adverſaries towards whom he profeſſeth open enmity, but onely the ſupreme Iudge; it inevitably followeth upon the Cardinalls owne words, beſides evident reaſon, that the Pope neither was in the Councell of *Trent*, nor can be in any Councell a lawfull Iudge, either of Proteſtants, or in thoſe cauſes which he then undertooke to judge, in which himſelfe was a party and *Reus*; ſeeing then, he ſhould be Iudge in his owne cauſe, which equity and reaſon, the law both divine and humane doe conſtantly prohibite.

34. Adde hereunto the judgement of the ancient and Catholike Church. I doe never reade, or almoſt remember the holy Councell of *Chalcedon*, but with a kinde of amazement I admire the rare piety, prudence, integrity, moderation, and gravity of thoſe moſt glorious Iudges, who ſupplying the Emperours place when he was abſent, were the Imperiall Preſidents in that Councell: Had they, or ſuch like Preſidents beene wanting at that time, it may juſtly be feared, conſidering the eagerneſſe and temerity, that I ſay not the inſolency of the Popes Legates in that Synod, that the Councell of *Chalcedon* had proved a worſe Latrociny than the ſecond *Epheſine* was. In that Councell both theſe cauſes now mentioned fell out, the one in *Dioſcorus*, the other in *Athanaſius* Biſhop of *Paros*. *Dioſcorus* came and ſate down in his place among the other Patriarks & Biſhops, as one who would be a Iudge in the cauſes propoſed; for in ancient Councels there was a dif-

n *Matth.* 18. 17 *Hoc quod Chriſtus dixit, Dic Eccleſiæ, omnes homines comprehendi, & quod Petrus & ejus ſucceſſores illa authoritate comprehendatur oſtendit Paulus qui in faciem reſtitit Cephæ: probat etiam hoc authoritas univerſalis Eccleſiæ, &c. Reſponſio Synodalis Concil. Baſil. pa. 105. a.*

o *Conc. 6. act. 13 Epiſtolas Honorii omni modo abjicimus & tanquam animæ noxias execramus. pa. 67. a. & Exclamaverunt univerſi, Honorio hæretico Anathema. Conc. 6. act. 26. pa. 79. a.*

p *Deteſtamur Sergium, Honorium, &c. Conc. Nic. 2. Act. 7. p. 386. b.*

q *Quamvis Honorius poſt mortem anathemate ſit affectus, manifeſtum tamen eſt illum de hæreſi fuiſſe accuſatum, qua ſola in cauſa licet inferioribus de ſuperioribus judicare. Conc. 8. Act. 7. pa. 891. b*

r *Poteſtati Eccleſiæ quilibet cujuſcunq; dignitatis, etiamſi papalis exiſtat, obedire tenetur in his quæ pertinent ad fidem. Conc. Conſtanc. ſeſſ. 4.*

s *Veritas hæc quod Concilium eſt ſupra Papam eſt veritas fidei Catholicæ. Conc. Baſil. ſeſſ. 33.*

t *Peccata eorum (Paparum) ſæpe dicta fuerunt Eccleſiæ, et ab Eccleſia punita, et qui non audierint Eccleſiam fuerunt habiti ut Ethnici et Publicani, ut legitur de Anaſtaſio et Liberio. Reſp. Synodalis Cons. Baſ. pa. 105. a. et pa. eadem b. enumerat Iob. 12. et alios.*

u *Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 21. §. Denig.*

a different [x] place, and ſeats for the Biſhops, who judged and gave ſentence in the Councell, and for others who were actors, whether plaintiffs and accuſers, or *Rei*, and accuſed. Now becauſe *Dioſcorus* himſelfe was the partie who was called into queſtion, and to be judged; and equity forbids a man to bee Iudge in his owne cauſe: The Councell, and by name the Popes Legates, (to whom the reſt therein aſſented) tooke this juſt exception thereat, and ſaid, [y] *Non patimur*; we cannot indure this wrong to be done, *ut iſte ſedeat qui judicandus advenit*; *that Dioſcorus, who is to bee judged, ſit as a Iudge in his owne cauſe*; upon which moſt juſt and equall motion, the glorious Iudges, who were Preſidents for order, commanded *Dioſcorus* to remove [z] from the Bench, as I may ſay, of Iudges, and to ſit in the middle of the Church, which was the place both for the Accuſers and *Rei*; and *Dioſcorus* accordingly ſate there, as the glorious Iudges had appointed: Vpon the very ſame ground of equitie did the religious Emperour command in the ſecond *Epheſine* Synod, that if [a] any queſtion or cauſe fell out to be debated concerning *Theodoret* (whom he commanded to be preſent) that then, *abſque illo Synodum convenire*; *the Synod ſhould aſſeble & judge that cauſe without Theodoret*; he ſhould have no judicatory power in his own cauſe: And the like he further cõmanded cõcerning that holy Biſh. *Flavianus*: He & ſome others had before in the Synod at *Conſtantinople* beene Iudges againſt *Eutiches*, and condemned him. An higher, even that generall Councell at *Epheſus* (which proved a Latrociny in the end) was called to examine [b] that judgment of *Flavianus* and the reſt, whether it was juſt or no. The Emperour commanded [c] thoſe who had beene Iudges of late, *in loco eorum eſſe qui judicandi ſunt*, now to bee in the place of *Rei*, *ſuch as were to bee judged*. A demonſtration, that if *Theodoſius* or *Martian*, or ſuch like worthy and equall Iudges as they were at *Chalcedon*, had been Preſidents for order in their *Trent* aſſembly; the Pope, though hee had beene as juſt and orthodoxall as *Flavianus*, much more being in impiety and hereſie farre ſuperiour to *Dioſcorus*, ſhould not have beene permitted to ſit among the Biſhops of the Councell, nor have ſo much as one ſingle deciſive ſuffrage or any judicatory power in his owne cauſe, much leſſe have had ſuch a ſupremacie of judgement, that his onely voyce and ſentence ſhould over-rule, and over-ſway the whole Councell beſides.

35. The other example is this: *Athanaſius* Biſhop of *Paros* being accuſed [d] of ſundry crimes, was called to triall before a Provinciall Councell at *Antioch*, held by *Domnus* Biſhop of that See, unto whoſe Patriarchall authority *Athanaſius* was ſubject; when hee refuſed to come after three citations, hee was depoſed by that Synod, and *Sabinianus* by the ſame authority, made Biſhop of *Paros* in his roome. In the Councel at *Chalcedon* *Athanaſius* came, complained of wrongfull extruſion, and deſired of the generall Councell, that his Biſhopricke might be reſtored unto him, pleading for his refuſall to come to trial at the Synod at *Antioch*, nothing elſe but this [e], that *Dõnus* who was the chiefe Iudge in that Synod, was his enemy; and therefore hee thought it not equall to be tryed before him, though he was his

x *Euſebius et Theodoretus in ordine accuſantium ſedent, ſicut et vos in loco accuſatorum ſedetis. Conc. Chal. Act. 1. pa. 13. a.*

y *Act. 1. Conc. Chal. pa. 5. a.*

z *Dioſcoro ſecundum juſſionem glorioſiſſ. Judicam, reſidẽte in medio. Ibid.*

a *Epiſt. Theodoſ. et Valent. ad Dioſc extat in Actis Conc. Chal. Act. 1. pa. 5. b.*

b *Nunc vos convenißis ut eos qui judicaverant judicetis. Elpidij dictum nomine Imper. in Conciliab. Epheſ. recitatur vero in Conc. Chal. Act. 1. pa. 13. b.*

c *Ibid.*

d *Conc. Chal. Act. 14. per totũ*

e *Dicat Athanaſius cur tertiò evocatus à Concilio Antiocheno, non occurrit. Athanaſius dixit, Quoniam inimicus meus erat ipſe qui judicabat, et rogo hæc relegi, et veritatẽ probari. Ib. pa. 117 b. Solum quia ſuus inimicus eſſet ipſe qui judicabat, clamavit, à ſanctâ Chal. Synodo ad cauſas illatas ſibi examinandas reſervatur. Epiſt. 8 Nich. 1. § Veniamus.*

his owne Patriarch. The glorious Iudges gave order that the accuſations againſt *Athanaſius* ſhould within eight moneths bee examined by *Maximus* then Biſhop of *Antioch*, and a Synod with him; and if he were found guilty of thoſe crimes, or any other worthy depoſition, he ſhould for ever want the Biſhopricke. But if either they did not within ſuch time examine the cauſe, or examining it, finde the accuſations untrue, that then the See of *Paros* ſhould be reſtored unto *Athanaſius*, as unjuſtly depoſed; and that *Sabinianus* ſhould remaine but a ſubſtitute unto him, untill *Maximus* could provide him of another Biſhopricke. Thus ordered the ſecular Iudges, and the whole Councell of *Chalcedon* approved this ſentence, crying out, *Nihil juſtius, nothing is more juſt*, nothing is more equall, this is a juſt ſentence, you judge according to Gods minde. O that once againe the world might bee ſo happy as to ſee one other ſuch holy Councell as was this of *Chalcedon*, and ſuch worthy Iudges to be Preſidents thereof. All the *Anathemaes* and cenſures of their Councell at *Trent*, where the Romane *Domnus* our capitall enemy was the chiefe, nay rather the onely Iudge, would even for this very cauſe be adjudged of no validity, nor of force to bind I ſay not other Churches, ſuch as theſe of *Britany*, but not thoſe very men who are otherwiſe ſubject to the Popes Patriarchall authority, as *Athanaſius* was to *Domnus*. Such an holy Councell would cauſe a *melius inquirendum* to be taken of all their judgements and proceedings againſt the Saints of God: and unleſſe they could juſtifie (which while the Sun and Moone endureth they can never) their ſlanderous crimes of hereſie imputed unto us, and withall purge themſelves of that Antichriſtian apoſtaſie whereof they are moſt juſtly accuſed and convicted, not onely in *foro poli*, but in their owne conſciences, and by the conſenting judgement of the Catholike Church for ſix hundred, nay in ſome points for fifteene hundred yeares after Chriſt, they ſhould and would by ſuch a Councell bee depoſed from all thoſe Epiſcopall dignities and functions which they have ſo long time uſurped and abuſed unto all tyranny, injuſtice, and ſubverſion of the Catholike Faith.

36. As the proceedings in that Councell were all unlawfull on the Popes part, ſo were they alſo both unlawfull and ſervile in reſpect of the other Biſhops, who were aſſeſſors in that Aſſembly. Could there poſſibly be any freedome or ſafety for Proteſtants among them, being the children of that generation which had moſt perfidiouſly violated their faith and promiſe to *Iohn Hus* in the Councell of *Conſtance*, and murdered the Prophets? Among whom that Canon authorizing trecherous and perfidious dealing, ſtood in force: *Quod* [f] *non obſtantibus, that notwithſtanding the ſafe conducts of Emperours*, Kings, or any other granted to ſuch as come to their Councels, *Quocunque vinculo ſe aſtrinxerint, by what bond ſoever they have tyed themſelves*, by promiſe, by their honour, by their oath, yet *non obſtante* any ſuch band they may bring them into inquiſition, and proceed to cenſure, to puniſh them as they ſhall thinke fit, and then vaunt and glory in their perfidiouſneſſe, ſaying, *Cæſar obſignavit* [g], *Chriſtianus orbis major Cæſare reſignavit*; *The Emperour hath ſealed this with his promiſe and oath, but our Coun-*

[f] *Conſt. Conſt. ſeſſ. 19.*

[g] *Campian. Rat. 4.*

cell

cell which is above the Emperour, hath repealed it; it ſhall not ſtand in force.

37. Could there be any freedome or liberty among thoſe who were by many obligations moſt ſervilely addicted to the Pope? The Apulian Biſhops [h] crying out, *aliorum omnium nomine, in the name of all the reſt in their Councell, Nihil aliud ſumus praterquam creaturæ & mancipia ſanctiſſimi patris: O, we are all but the Popes creatures, his very ſlaves.* The complaint [i] of the Biſhop of *Arles* might here be renewed, which he made of ſuch like Councels, at *Baſil*, that muſt bee done, and of neceſſity be done and decreed in Councells, *quod nationi placeat Italicæ, which the Italian nation ſhall affect*; which country alone [k] for multitude of Biſhops doth equall or exceed other nations: and this very Italian faction to have prevailed at *Trent*, their owne Biſhop *Eſpencæus*, who was at the Councell, doth teſtifie: *Hæc [l] illa Helena eſt, this is the Helena* which of late prevailed at *Trent*; this Italian faction overſwayed all: whereof *Molineus* [m] gives a plaine inſtance. For when an wholeſome Canon, that the Pope might not diſpence in ſome matters, had like to have beene decreed, many in the Councell liking well thereof, the Pope procured a reſpite [n] for that buſineſſe for a month and an halfe, during which time ſome forty poore Biſhops of *Italy* and *Sicily* were ſhipped and ſent to *Trent*, like ſo many *levis armaturæ milites*, and ſo the good Canon was by their valour diſcomfited and rejected by that holy Synod. Some of the Councell alſo were the Popes penſioners, and ſtipendary Biſhops, nay rather ought than Biſhops: ſuch as among others were *Olaus Magnus* [o], the titular Archbiſhop of *Vpſala* in *Gothia*, and *Robertus Venantius* the titular [p] and blinde Biſhop of *Armach*, and yet not halfe ſo blinde in body as in minde; Archbiſhops [q] without Archbiſhoprickes, without a Church, without a Clergy, without Dioceſſe, without any revenues, ſave a ſmall * penſion which the Pope allowed them, that they might be cyphers in the Councell, and taking his pay might doe him ſome ſervice for it, and grace his Synod with their ſubſcriptions. But all the other bonds are as nothing to that [r] oath wherewith every one of them was tyed and fettered to the Pope, ſwearing to uphold the Papall authority againſt all men, and to fight [s] againſt all that ſhould rebell againſt him: an oath ſo execrable, that *Æneas Sylvius* is [t] mentioned to have ſaid, *Quod etiam verum dicere contra Papam ſit contra Epiſcoporum juramentum, that even to ſpeake the truth, to ſpeake for the truth, if it be contrary to the Pope, is againſt the oath of Biſhops.* By this they were ſo tyed, *ut [u] ne mutire quidem ipſis liceat adverſus Idolum Romanum, that they might not ſo much as whiſper againſt him.*

38. Verily none of thoſe Iron chaines which were uſed by *Dioſcorus* in the *Epheſine* Latrocinie are comparable to theſe: No ſubſcription unto blankes like the ſwearing to maintaine whatſoever their Romane *Dioſcorus* ſhall define. They who were not chained might have no place in the Synod; they who were chained with ſuch bands, and ſpecially with ſuch an oath, could have no freedome in the Synod; they muſt ſpeake, thinke, and teach nothing but what the Pope breathes into them. Had there beene ſuch wiſe and worthy Iudges for

h Carol. Molin. lib. de Concil. Trident. nu. 21.

i Cl. Eſtenc. com. in Epiſt. ad Tit. ca. 1. pa. 42.

k *Vt quæ ſola Epiſcoporum numero nationes alias æquet aut ſuperet ibid.*

l *Ibid.*

m Car. Mol. loco citato.

n Pont fex ad ſeſquimenſem decreti concluſionem ampliari juſſit. ibid.

o Olaus Magnus Suevus qui Archiepiſcopi Vpſalenſis nomen et titulum vendicabat, quæ quidem regio nec Pontificem unquam, nec Eccleſiam Romanam agnovit. Gent. Exam. Conc. Trid. ſeſſ. 1. nu. 3

p *Ibid.*

q *Archiepiſcopi, ſine Archiepiſcopatu, ſine Eccleſia, ſine Clero, ſine ullo cenſu & reditu. ibid.*

* *Hos Archiepiſcopos rerum tenues & inopes Romæ ſuis ſtipendiis alucrat Pontifex. ibid. Olao in ſingulos menſes 15. aureos nummos ſuppeditabat. ibid.*

r Extr. ad Iurejur ca. Ego N.

s *In nova juramenti forma inſuper hoc Jurant Epiſcopi, ſe hæreticos, omneſq; rebelles Pontificis extremè infeſtaturos, & perſequuturos. Grav. oppoſ. Conc. Trident. p. 2. cauſ. 4 pa. 52.*

t *Ibidem in Paral. ad Abbat. Vſper. pa. 418.*

u *Ibid. pa. 31.*

for Preſidents of that Councell, as there was at *Chalcedon*, could they poſſibly have endured to ſee all ſynodall freedome thus oppreſſed and baniſhed? Nay they would in their zeale to God and his truth, have broken and burſt in ſunder every linke of that chaine: And as [x] *Ibas* and *Theodoret* were not admitted to the Councel of *Chalcedon* as members thereof, till they had openly renounced and anathematized the hereſies which they had before embraced: So would not thoſe glorious Iudges have permitted any of thoſe *Tridentine* Biſhops to have ſit in the Councell, till they had openly renounced, anathematized, and abjured that oath, and with it their vaſſallage to the Pope, and all thoſe hereticall doctrines which by their adhering to the Pope, and following his faction, they had embraced: and thoſe are Image-worſhip, Tranſubſtantiation, proper Sacrifice, Adoration of the Hoſt, their Purgatorian fire, and the reſt of thoſe hereſies, which, ſince the Romane faction began to prevaile, (and that was about ſeven hundred yeares after Chriſt, in the dayes of *Gregory* the ſecond, who as I ſuppoſe, firſt of all by ſynodall judgement decreed the worſhip of Images,) they have maintained: For ſeeing ſince that time not truth nor equity, but faction prevailed in their Synods, and ſwayed matters in their Church, there could be no equall triall of the truth by any of their Synods held ſince that time. But when all the Biſhops were freed from thoſe chaines of their oath and ſlaviſh bondage to the Pope, ſince the faction (whereof he hath beene the leader) got the upper hand, thoſe glorious Iudges would have permitted nothing to paſſe for a free ſynodall ſentence, but that onely which could have had warrant from the Scriptures, thoſe holy Councells and conſenting judgement of thoſe Fathers who lived within the ſix hundred yeares or ſomewhat more after Chriſt, at what time partiality and faction had not corrupted and blinded their judgement, as in the ſecond *Nicene*, and ever ſince it hath.

x *Conc. Chalc. act. 8. & 10.*

39. But becauſe ſuch glorious Iudges and their moſt equall Preſidency was wanting, nay was baniſhed from their Aſſembly at *Trent*, ſcarce any tokens or ſhadow of freedome could take place therein. Not towards Proteſtants. *Brentius* [y], and divers other learned Divines came to *Trent*, offered [z] themſelves and their faith to triall of diſputations, *Nulla ratione* [a] *impetrari potuit, this could not be obtained by any meanes*, that they ſhould come to diſpute [b] for the faith. [c] *Nullus unquam liber aditus Proteſtantibus, the Proteſtants at no time had any free-done to come to the Councell at Trent.* Not towards their owne Biſhops, if they ſpake or did ought tending to the defence of the truth. *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Bitons* ſaid [d], that Chriſt offered not in his laſt ſupper his owne body and blood: this croſſed their proper ſacrifice of the maſſe, therfore *Cornelius* for that free & true ſpeech, *à Patribus univerſis exploſus eſt, was hiſſed out of their Trent Councell by all the Fathers and Divines there preſent.* *Iacobus Nachiantes* [e] Biſhop of *Clodia Foſſa*, ſayd, he could not approve that traditions ſhould be held in equal reverence as the Scripture, he was for this truth expulſed the Councell. *Gulielmus* [f] *Venetus* a Dominican Fryer, ſayd in the Councell, that the Councell was above the Pope, he was commanded to depart out of the Councell.

y *Gent. Exam. Conc. Trid. ſeſſ. 15. nu. 3.*
z *Obſecrant in diſputationis aream deſcendere, & ſe certamine offerebant. ibid.*
a *Ibidem.*
b *Neque admiſſi fuerint ad ſuæ fidei profeſſionẽ proponendam & diſcutiendam, et haud unquam admitti potuerunt ut ſuam fidei confeſſionem in ſynodi publico conventu exhiberent, ac multo minus ut dogmata quę in ea continebantur diſputatione aſſererent. ibid. Gen. in Exam. lib. 5. nu. 4. pa. 317.*
c *Ibid. pa. 320.*
d *Melc. Can. lib. 12. loc. Theol. ca. 13. §. Extat.*
e *Cypr. Valer. in Marc. 2.*
f *Ibid.*

cell. Another of the Biſhops [g] hapning to touch, and that but lightly, the pride of the Pope in his titles, wiſhed, that ſeeing God is no where in the Scripture called *ſanctiſſimus*, but *ſanctus*, the Pope alſo would be content with the ſame title of *ſanctus*, and not take a more ample name of honour than is given in Scripture unto God. The Pope being certified hereof, ſent for him to come from *Trent* to *Rome*, and gave him to his Officers to uſe him hardly [h], and to bee degraded. *Petrus Vergerius* [i] Biſhop of *Iuſtinianople*, (he who endeavoring [k] to refute the Proteſtant writings, and began that booke which hee intituled, Againſt the Apoſtates of *Germany*, was himſelfe overcome by the evidence of that truth, ſpecially in the doctrine of Iuſtification, which he oppugned) came to the Councell at *Trent*: The Pope having intelligence that he was inclined to *Lutheraniſme*, writ to his Legats at *Trent*, *Ne locum ei tribuant in conſeſſu*, *That they ſhould not admit him into their Councell*, but command him to depart. *Ad hunc* [l] *modum eliminatus*, *by this meanes was the Biſhop excluded from their free Synod*: and if *Iohannes Caſus* the Popes Legate to the Venetians, and Archbiſhop of *Beneventum*, (who writ a [m] booke in the praiſe of one of the moſt deteſtable and damnable ſinnes) could have prevailed to have entiſed [n] him to goe to *Rome*, he had not thence eſcaped ſo eaſily as he did from *Trent*. Could any of theſe or the like enormous diſorders, which utterly ſubvert all ſynodall freedome, have beene endured, had there beene equall and prudent Preſidents for Kings and Emperours in that Councell? But the Imperiall preſidency being abandoned, together with it, was all freedome and ſynodall orders excluded. So that I may truly ſay both of theſe *Tridentine*, and their other nine Synods, that as by reaſon of their want of this Imperiall preſidency, they had many diſorders, ſo by reaſon they excluded that Preſidency, they had, nay they could have nothing in them at all but diſorder.

40. You ſee now the ſeverall kinds of unlawfull Councells, as well by want of Imperiall calling, or of Imperiall Preſidency, as when neither is wanting, by the abuſe of that Imperiall authority in the Synod. And though the unlawfulneſſe of thoſe ten later Synods doth now appeare to be farre greater than of thoſe ancient Councells before mentioned; ſeeing in all the ancient there was not onely a lawfull calling, but a lawfull preſidency alſo, both which were wanting in the other tenne; beſides the unlawfull proceedings which were equally in both, or rather farre worſe in the later: yet is there one eſpeciall difference that is principally to be remembred, which iſſuing from the former diverſity of unlawfulneſſe, makes a greater oddes than at the firſt one would imagine: and this it is: When the unlawfulneſſe of any Synod ariſeth (as in their tenne Synods it doth) from the want of the firſt condition, that is, of lawfull calling and authority to aſſemble and judge, be the conſultations and proceedings of ſuch Synods otherwiſe never ſo orderly, and their reſolutions never ſo juſt and true, yet for making of any Canon or Decree, or giving any ſynodall judgement, there is an invalidity in all ſuch Synods, and a meere nullity in all their Decrees, Canons, and Iudgements. They had no authority to aſſemble in a Synod, much leſſe [o] have they any authority to make a Law, or

[g] *Car. Molin. li. de Conc. Trid. nu. 22.*

[h] *Satal'tibus ſuis de gradu deiciendum & dariter tractandum propinavit. Ibid.*

[i] *Iob. Sleid. Com. lib. 21. pa. 304. & ſeq.*

[k] *Dum confutãdi cauſa libros adverſariorum diligenter excutit, & attente argumenta conſiderat, captum ſe victum q; ſenſit. Ibid.*

[l] *Ibid. & plura de eo lege apud Cypr. Valer. in Marcel. 2.*

[m] *Nec puduit eum ſcelus omnium longe turpiſſimum celebrare laudibus. Iob. Sleid. loc. citat.*

[n] *Eum, uti Romam peteret modis omnibus hortatur Caſus; Vergerius vero qui periculum ſuum intelligeret, recuſat. Ibid.*

[o] *Si legitima ſynodus non fuit, planum eſt nullã authoritatem potuiſſe habere: & nullius roboris ſint illius canones. Bell. lib. 2 de Pont. ca. 18. §. Caterum: & §. Ac deinde. & Sententia à non ſuo Iudice dicta nihil firmitatis obtinet. Greg lib. 11. Epiſt. 56.*

or give judgement in that Synod. That which is invalid in the ſpring and originall, muſt needs in all the ſubſequent actions derived from thence, & depending thereon, retain the ſame invalidity. And ſeeing it is neither multitude, nor learning, nor wiſdome, but authority which is the fountain and foundation of all Lawes, Canons, and Iudgements, where this authority is wanting in any perſon or aſſembly, it is as impoſſible for ſuch a perſon or aſſembly to make a law, give any judgement, or pronounce any judiciall ſentence, as to erect an houſe in the ayre, or build without any foundation. And truly this toucheth at the quick all thoſe ten Councels, which wanting authority to aſſemble them, were no other but tumultuous, ſeditious, and unauthorized aſſemblies. There was no more ſtrength, validity, or vigour in any of their Decrees to binde as lawes, or ſynodall judgements, than there was in ſuch Edicts as *Spartacus* and *Catiline* in *Rome*, or *Iacke Cade* in this Kingdome ſhould have publiſhed and ſet forth: ſpecially in that which he like another Pope intended to be his fundamentall law, That all lawes ſhould proceed out of his mouth. Thoſe which they untruly call the Canons, Decrees, or Iudgements of thoſe Synods, are onely the opinions, reſolutions, and conſultations of ſo many ſeditious men which cõvened and conſpired together in thoſe conjurations: ſynodall Decrees, or Eccleſiaſticall Lawes and Iudgements they were not, they could not be. In the head, they are nipt and tainted with a nullity of authority, they beare this tainture and nullity throughout every part and parcell of their determinations.

41. But when the unlawfulneſſe of any Synod ariſeth (as in the ancient Councels at *Arimine*, *Millane*, and *Epheſus* it did) from the want of the other condition, that is, of orderly proceedings onely, the Biſhops being both lawfully called, and having a lawfull Preſident, the caſe is here farre different; their acts and ſentences though they bee unlawfull, yet are they truly judiciall, and have the authority of ſynodall judgements, and therefore doe binde others, though not in conſcience to accept them as true, yet with patience to ſubmit themſelves to their cenſures, till by like authority they be revoked, and repealed. Even as in civill Courts, though an unjuſt or partiall Iudge, either for feare, favour, hatred, deſire of lucre, or any other perturbation of minde, ſhall wilfully pervert juſtice and due proceedings, and pronounce an unjuſt ſentence: yet is this act judiciall, and ſtands in force of a judgement, till by the like, or higher authority it be reverſed; becauſe ſuch an one had authority and rightfull power to judge and give ſentence in that cauſe, though he abuſed his authority to injuſtice and wrong: Right ſo it is in ſynodall and Eccleſiaſticall aſſemblies, when they are lawfully called and authorized to heare and judge any matter, their want of due, orderly, and juſt proceedings makes their judgment unjuſt, and ſhewes them to be wicked and malicious conſpirators againſt the truth, but it doth not make the decree to be no judgment, or no judiciall ſentence of a Councell. The corruption is now in the branch, not in the root: the abuſe of their authority makes not a nullity in their act: It hinders not them to bee truly and rightfully Iudges, but it demonſtrates them not to bee upright, good, and juſt

Iudges,

Iudges, it ſhewes their ſentence to be wicked and impious, but it hinders it not to be a judiciall ſentence. Whereof that one (among many) in the *Epheſine* Latrociny, is a cleare example. In it [p] *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Dorileum* was moſt wickedly and unjuſtly depoſed from his See, yet this their unjuſt ſentence ſtood in force, till by the like authority of another generall Councell at *Chalcedon*, it was repealed: for in it *Euſebius* ſate not at the firſt as a Iudge, but as an accuſer [q] of *Dioſcorus*, and in the place of accuſers: He entreated the holy Councell that all the Acts [r] and Iudgements at *Epheſus*, *viribus carere*, might be adnull'ed and declared to be of no force, and that hee might enjoy as before that ſentence he did, *Sacerdotali dignitate, his Epiſcopall dignity and See.* The holy Synod conſented to his juſt requeſt, received him as a member [s] of the Councell, reſtored him to his See, and adnulled all the acts of the *Epheſine* Latrociny, requeſting [t] the Emperour to ratifie and confirme that their Iudgement.

p *Flavianum et Euſebium ab omni Epiſcopali dignitate judicamus eſſe alienos. Conc. Epheſ. in act. Con. Chal. act. 1. pa. 57. b.*

q *Et Euſebius et Theodoretus in ordine accuſantium ſedent. Con. Chalc. act. 1. pa. 13. a.*

r *Conc. Chalc. act. 3. pa. 66.*

s *Acts act. 6. pa. 101. b. Euſebius Doritei ſubſcribit definitioni fidei inter alios.*

t *Præſens omne Concilium deprecatur Imperatorem quatenus pia lege ſanciat, neq; Synodum illam (Epheſinam 2.) nominari, neque quidquam quod actum eſt in ea teneri. Conc. Chalc. act. 10. p. 115. §. Anatolius. & pa. 116. Omnes eadem dicimus.*

42. Such an exceeding great and moſt remarkable difference there is betwixt thoſe ancient and theſe ten later unlawfull Synods. Though both be unlawfull, yet in the former there was a binding force for a while, till they were repealed; but in theſe later there never was any power to binde any, either to accept their Decrees, or to undergoe their cenſures, becauſe *ab initio* there was a meere nullity in all their Acts. Againe, the inflicting of any puniſhment upon the judgement of the former, had the warrant, though not of divine, yet of humane authority, and was to bee preſumed as juſt, (the ſentence of every Iudge, even *eo nomine*, becauſe he is a Iudge, being to bee preſumed juſt, untill upon evident proofe it bee declared to bee unjuſt.) But what cenſures or puniſhments ſoever are, or at any time have beene denounced or inflicted on any, upon the warrant or Iudgement of theſe laſt ten Synods, they are all *ab initio* meerely tyrannous, and unjuſt, inflicted without any either divine or humane authority, (ſeeing thoſe Synods had none at all) there is not ſo much as a preſumption that they were or could be juſt, but for their want of authority in decreeing them, they are (though otherwiſe equall) preſumed to be unjuſt.

43. And thus much I have thought good to inſert concerning all ſorts of Councels, as well lawfull as unlawfull: to manifeſt hereby not onely the injurious dealing of *Baronius* with this fift Councell, againſt which he declameth as an impious and unlawfull conſpiracy; but their vanity alſo in extolling and magnifying many, and ſpecially thoſe laſt ten, for holy, lawfull, and oecumenicall Synods; of which dignity they are ſo farre ſhort, that they are all moſt deſervedly to be ranked with the *Epheſine* Latrocinie, and put in the *Claſſis* of thoſe which of all other are the moſt baſe, impious, unlawfull, and diſorderly Councells.

CAP.

CAP. XX.

How Cardinall Baronius *revileth the Emperour* Iuſtinian, *and a refutation of the ſame.*

1. WE E have hitherto ſeene and fully examined all the materiall exceptions which *Baronius* could deviſe to excuſe Pope *Vigilius* from hereſie: and in them conſiſts the whole pith, and all the ſinewes of the cauſe; they being the onely arguments which are to be reckoned as the lawfull warriers of the Cardinall. Now followeth that other Troupe, whereof I told you [a] before, of his piraticall and diſorderly Straglers, which the Cardinall hath muſtred together, not that they ſhould diſpute or reaſon in this cauſe, but to raile and revile at every thing whereat their Leader is diſpleaſed: And the Cardinall doth this with ſo impotent affections, in ſo immodeſt, that I ſay not ſo ſcurrill a manner, and with ſuch virulency of all uncivill and moſt undutiful ſpeeches, that you ſhall ſee him now, having caſt away all that gravity and modeſty which is fit not onely for a Divine, a Cardinall, a Diſputer, but for a man of any temper, or ſobriety, to act herein no other part but *Hercules Furens*, or *Ajax maſtigophorus*; without all reſpect either of authority, or dignity, or innocency, laſhing every body, and every thing that comes in his way, be it friend or foe; ſparing nothing that ſeemes to croſſe his fancy, not the Emperour *Iuſtinian*, not the Empreſſe *Theodora*, not *Theodorus* Biſhop of Ceſarea, not the Imperiall Edict, not the controverſie and cauſe it ſelfe of the *Three Chapters*, not the Acts of the holy Generall Councell, not Pope *Vigilius* himſelfe; nothing can ſcape the whippe of his tongue and pen. Let us begin with the Emperour, againſt whom *Baronius* declameth in this manner.

2. *Princes* [b] *to dare to make lawes for Prieſts? who ſhould obey the lawes made by them. Such* [c] *an one as* Iuſtinian *make lawes of faith?* an [d] *abcedary Emperour: an illiterate* [e] *Theologue: utterly* [f] *unlearned: who* [g] *knew not how to reade: who* [h] *could never reade the title of the Bible: no not the very firſt* [i] *elements: not his* Alpha, Beta: *He on a ſodaine to become a* [k] *palliated Divine? Hee to preſcribe lawes* [l] *for the Church, as ſubject to his? Hee againſt* [m] *all right and equity to preſume to make lawes of ſacred matters, of Prieſts? He to ſet downe puniſhments for them? Hee who was not onely thus utterly unlearned, but withall an enemy to the Church; a* [n] *ſacrilegious perſon: a* [o] *perſecutor: a grievous, a* [p] *monſtrous perſecutor: one who was madde* [q]*, franticke, and out of his wits, who was poſſeſſed with an evill ſpirit, and driven by the Devill himſelfe? Such an one* [r] *make lawes for Biſhops?*

[a] *Cap. 5. nu. 1.*
[b] *Vides quanta faſtura— cum Principes indicere audent ipſis ſacerdotibus leges, à quibus ſanctas ſervare ipſi debent. Bar. an. 553. nu. 237.*
[c] *Si qui ejuſmodi eſſet, leges ſanciret de fide, an. 546. nu. 43.*
[d] *Fuit homo penitus illiteratus, adeo ut nec Alphabetum aliquando didiciſſet, an. 528. nu. 2*
[e] *Illiteratus Theologus, an. 551 nu. 2.*
[f] *Cum eſſet penitus illiteratus, an. 546. nu. 41.*
[g] *Iuſtiniani legere neſcientis, an. 538. nu. 32.*
[h] *Qui nunquam legere ſciverit vel ipſum foris inſcriptum titulum Bibliorum, an. 551. nu. 4.*
[i] *Vt qui nec prima elementa calleret, ut legere poſſet, an. 546 nu. 43.*
[k] *Fecit analphabetum Imperatorem repente paliatum apparere Theologum, an. 551. nu. 4.*
[l] *Cui ut ſibi ſubdite aggreſſus erat præſcribere leges, an. 551. nu. 2.*
[m] *Sacrarii legũ cõditorem agit: de ſacerdotibus leges ferre, et eoſque pœnas ſtatuere, præter jus faſq; præſumens, an. 528. nu. 2.*
[n] *Ab Imperatoris ſacrilegi violentia, an. 552. nu. 8.*
[o] *Juſt. à perſequutione ceſſavit, an. 553. nu. 14.*
[p] *Et quod monſtroſius acceſſit, ab Imperatore perſequutio excitata fuit, et haud quidem levis, an 553. nu. 221.*
[q] *Ab Imperatoris furore, an. 552. nu. 8. ille furore percitus, mente dimotus, correptus maligno ſpiritu, agitatus à Satana, an. 551. nu. 2.*
[r] *A quo accepturi eſſent leges Epiſcopi, an. 551. nu. 4.*

what

what is this elſe, but to confound[t] *all things, to treade*[t] *under foote the ſacred Canons, to aboliſh utterly the Church diſcipline, to*[u] *diſſolve all divine order, and to make of the Kingdome of heaven (which the Church is) the very priſon of hell, where there is nothing but confuſion?* Thus the Cardinall: And this is but the firſt pageant of his *Ajax*, and but ſome gleanings neither of that harveſt, which is abundant in his Annals.

t *Confundi omnia neceſſe eſt*, an. 553. nu. 237.
t *Canones ipſe conculcat, eviſque peſſundat Eccleſiaſticam œconomiam*, an. 541. nu. 16.
u *Sicq; omnem in Eccleſia diſſolveret ordinem, faceretque ex regno cœlorum ergaſtulum inferorum*, an. 551. nu. 4.

3. Not to ſeeke any exact, or methodicall refutation hereof: All that the Cardinall hath hitherto ſaid may bee reduced to three notorious ſlanders, by which he laboureth to blemiſh the immortall fame and unſpotted honour of that moſt religious Emperour. The firſt concernes *His knowledge and learning*; *Iuſtinian* not able to reade? not know ſo much as his *Alphabet*? Is there any in the world, thinke you, ſo very ſtupid, as to beleeve the Cardinall in this ſo ſhameleſſe, ſo incredible an untruth? *Tanti ingenii, tantæque doctrinæ fuiſſe conſtat*, ſaith *Platina*[x]; it is manifeſt, that *Iuſtinian* was of ſo great a wit, and ſo great learning, that it is not to bee marveiled if hee reduced the lawes, being confuſed before, into order: *Tritemius*[y] ſaith of him, *He was a man of an excellent wit, and hee is deſervedly*[z] *reckoned among Eccleſiaſticall Writers*; and hee expreſly mentioneth three bookes which hee writ againſt *Eutyches*, one againſt the Africane Biſhops: adding, that none may doubt, but that beſides theſe, hee writ many and very excellent Epiſt. *Poſſevine*[a] the Ieſuite acknowledgeth him, with *Tritemius*, for an *Eccleſiaſticall Writer*; & beſides the reciting of thoſe ſame books which *Tritemius* mentioned, hee alleageth theſe words of their Pontificall, moſt worthy to be obſerved for this purpoſe: *Iuſtinian the Emperour a religious man, ſent unto the Apoſtolike See his profeſſion of faith, Scriptam chirographo proprio, written with his own hand, teſtifying his great love to the Chriſtiã Religion.* In regard of wch his excellẽt writings, both Pope *Agatho* *, and the whole ſixt generall Councell with him, who lived in the next age to *Iuſtinian*, reckoneth him in the ſame ranke, not onely of Eccleſiaſticall Writers, but of venerable Fathers, with Saint *Cyrill*, Saint *Chryſoſtome* and others, whoſe writings doe give teſtimony to the truth. *Liberatus* who lived in the dayes of *Iuſtinian*, and who was no well-willer of the Emperour, yet could not but record, *That he*[b] *writ a Booke againſt the Acephali or Eutichean heretikes, in defence of the Councell of Chalcedon, and that* Theodorus *ſeeing him ſo toyled in writing againſt heretikes, told him, Scribendi laborem non eum debere pati*; That he ſhould not trouble himſelfe with writing books, but maintaine the faith by publiſhing Edicts. *Procopius*[c], who was familiarly converſant with *Iuſtinian*, recites that traiterous perſwaſion of *Arſaces* to *Artabanus*, when he excited him to murther the Emperour; *This* (ſaid hee) *you may doe eaſily, and without danger, for the Emperour is not miſtruſtfull, and he paſſeth the time till very late of the night in talking without any watch or guard, having none but ſome old and feeble Biſhops about him, Chriſtianorum ſcriptis miro ſtudio revolvendis intentus*, being marvellouſly addicted to reade and peruſe the writings of Chriſtians. Are theſe, thinke you, the actions of an illiterate, ofan Abcedary Emperour? And what ſpeake I of theſe? The Pandects, the Code, the Authentikes, the Inſtitutions, the whole body of the law proclame

x *In vita Bonifac. 2.*
y *Lib. de ſcript. Eccl. ſ.*
z *Locum inter Eccleſiaſticos ſcriptores merito acquiſivit. Ibid.*
a *Appar. Sac. in verbo Iuſtinianus.*
* *Conc. 6. Act. 4. in Epiſt. Agath.*
b *In Brevia. ca. 24.*
c *Lib. 3. de bell. Goth.*

the incredible wiſedome, and rare knowledge of *Iuſtinian*, *All people* ſaith he,[d] *are governed by the lawes, Tam à nobis promulgatis quam compoſitis*, as well publiſhed as compoſed by us: and though he uſed the learning, helpe, and induſtry of other worthy men, (whoſe names he hath commended to all poſterity, and never-dying fame) yet when they offred the bookes unto him, *Et legimus & recognovimus*, ſaith he,* wee both read them and examined them; which the gloſſe explaineth, ſaying, *Nos ipſi legimus*, We our ſelves have reade and peruſed them. So that I cannot ſufficiently admire this moſt ſhameleſſe untruth of *Baronius*, in reviling him for an illiterate, and not ſo much as an Abcedarie ſcholler, whoſe wit, learning, and prudence hath beene, and will for ever bee a mirrour to all ages.

d *Inſtit. Proem.*

* *Ibid.*

4. But *Suidas* (ſaith the Cardinall[e]) doth affirme[f] the ſame; calling *Iuſtinian* ἀγραμμάτιστον, and void of all learning. For anſwer whereunto, firſt, I would gladly know of the Cardinal, how hee can aſſure us that this is indeed the ſaying of *Suidas*? ſpecially ſeeing their owne Ieſuite *Poſſevine* tels[g] us for a certainty, that *Plæraque, very many things are falſly inſerted into Suidas*; and that, *à Sciolis & Schiſmaticis*, by ſome ſmatterers or Schiſmaticks; and further, that thoſe *Plæraque*, are ſuch as are *repugnant to the Euangelicall truth, and Hiſtoricall ſincerity*. How may we bee aſſured, that this concerning *Iuſtinian*, is not one of thoſe *Plæraque*, ſeeing this to be contrary to Hiſtoricall ſincerity, doth by thoſe many and evident proofes which wee before produced, fully appeare? Againe, admitting *Suidas* for the Author thereof: is *Suidas* thinke you of more, or equall authority and credit to their Pontificall? which witneſſeth expreſly, that *Iuſtinian* writ the holy confeſſion of his faith, *Chirographo proprio*, with his owne hand? Equall to *Tritemius* and *Poſſevine*, or (to winke at them) to Pope *Agatho* and the ſixt generall Councell? who all account *Iuſtinian* among the Writers of the Church. Who I pray you was this *Suidas*? truly an earneſt defender of thoſe impieties, which in their ſecond Nicene Synod began to prevaile; who in reviling manner doth call[h] *Conſtantine Iconomachus, a Serpent, an Antichriſt, and the diſciple of the Devill*: and all, for his not conſenting to the *adoration of Images, and reliques, and to the Invocation of Saints*. Now how this ſort of men were given to lyes and fables, the Acts of that Synod doe fully demonſtrate: Or if you rather deſire to have their Ieſuites judgement of *Suidas*, hee will tell you firſt, that he was hereticall, *in teaching*[i] *the Eſſence in the Godhead to be generative; which their Laterane Councell hath condemned for an hereſie*. Hee will tell you further, that this booke is full of errours, fables, and lyes, of which ſort are theſe, among many. *That the world was made of the Poëticall Chaos; that it ſhal continue* 1200. *thouſand yeares: that the Sun and Starres, are fierie ſubſtances, fed and perpetuated by terreſtriall humours as their nutriment: that Paradiſe is Hortus penſilis, a garden hanging in the ayre farre above the earth: that* Caine *was begotten of the Devill, which is a lye; that the Iewes adored an aſſes head, and every ſeventh yeare ſacrificed a ſtranger: His narration* (*in verbo Nero*) touching *Annas* and *Caiphas, Pilate, Peter*, and *Simon Magus*, wherin *multa comminiſcitur, he forgeth many things: His narration* (*in verbo Iulianus*) which hee calleth in expreſſe words, *mendacium flagitioſiſſimum*, a moſt lewd lie: *His ſlandering*

e *Bar. an. 528. nu. 2.*

f *In verbo Inſt.*

g *In appar. verbo Suidas.*

h *Suid. in verbo Conſtantinus.*

i *Poſſ. in verbo Suidas.*

dering Conſtantine the great, as baſe of birth, and his ſonne *Criſpus* as inceſtuous: His commending of *Acatius* and *Aceſius* two heretikes: adding, that *hee writeth many things, contra Hiſtoriæ veritatem, againſt the Hiſtoricall truth.* His relation (*in verbo Apolonius*) where many things are praiſed, *quæ omnia monſtroſa ſunt, & prorſus explodenda*; all which are utterly to be hiſſed at: where alſo he ſeemeth to allow the impious Art of Magicke, and Divinations: His approving of *Appolonius* and *Danis*, two wicked Magitians, who both are *relegati ad inferos*, condemned to Hell. And to omit very many of this kinde of impieties and fables, which abound in *Suidas*: His narration (*in verbo Ieſus*:) which not onely *Baronius* rejecteth, but Pope *Paul* the fourth, for that cauſe beſide ſome other [k] exploded the booke of *Suidas*, and placed it in the ranke *librorum prohibitorum*: Such, even by the confeſſion of their owne Ieſuite; is this *Suidas*: a depraver of good, a commender of wicked men, a fabler, a lyer, a falſifier of Hiſtories, a Magitian, an Heretike, whoſe booke is by the Pope forbidden to bee read. Such a worthy witneſſe hath the Cardinall of his *Suidas*, with whom he conſpireth in reviling *Iuſtinian*, as one utterly unlearned. Concerning which untruth, I will ſay no more at this time than that which *Gotofrid* doth in his cenſure [l] of thoſe words of *Suidas*, where calling it in plaine termes a ſlander, he rejects it, as it juſtly deſerveth, in this manner, *Valeant calumniæ, nos ſinceriora ſequamur*; Away with this and ſuch like opprobrious ſlanders of *Suidas* and *Baronius*; but let us follow the truth.

k *Exploſerit in Indicem lib. probib.*

l *Aste lib. Iuſtit.*

5. His ſecond reproofe of the Emperour is, for *preſuming to make lawes in cauſes of faith; which for Kings and Emperours to doe, brings* (as he ſaith) *an helliſh confuſion into the Church of God*: The wit of a Cardinal! *Iuſtinian* may not doe that which King *Hezekiah*, which *Aſa*, which *Ioſiah*, and *Conſtantine* the great, the two *Theodoſii*, *Martian*, and other holy Emperours before had done, and done it by the warrant of God, to the eternall good of the Church, and their owne immortall fame: Had hee indeed, or any of thoſe Emperours taken upon them by their lawes to eſtabliſh ſome new, erronious, or hereticall doctrine, the Cardinall might in this caſe have juſtly reproved them; but this they did not: what doctrines the Prophets delivered, the word of God taught, and holy Synods had before decreed and explaned; thoſe, and none elſe did *Iuſtinian*, by his Edict, and other religious Emperours, ratifie by their imperiall authority: Heare *Iuſtinians* owne words, *Wee* [f] *have thought it needfull by this our Edict to manifeſt that right confeſſion of faith, quæ in ſancta Dei Eccleſiâ prædicatur*, which is preached in the holy Church of God. Here is no new faith; no Edict for any new doctrine, but for maintaining that onely faith which the holy Catholike Church taught, and the Councell of *Chalcedon* had decreed; wherein that *Iuſtinian* did nothing but worthy of eternal praiſe, the whole fift Councell, and the whole Catholike Church approving it, is a witneſſe aboue exception, which entreating of that which *Iuſtinian* had done in this cauſe of the *Three Chapters*; (the chiefe of all wch was the publiſhing of his moſt religious Edict, to cõdemne the ſame) ſaith, [g] *Omnia ſemper fecit & facit, quæ ſanctam Eccleſiam & recta*

f *Edict. Juſtin. in cauſa trium Capitul. in princip.*

g *Col. 7. in fine*

recta dogmata conſervant; *Iuſtinian* hath ever done, and as yet doth all things which preſerve the holy Church, and the true faith. So the Councell. Is not *Baronius* minde compoſed of venome and malice, who condemnes and reviles the Emperour, as bringing helliſh confuſion into the Church, by publiſhing that law, which to have beene an eſpeciall meanes to preſerve the Church and Catholike faith, the holy generall Councell, and all the whole Catholike Church with it proclameth.

6. See here againe the love and reſpect which *Baronius* beares to the Imperiall lawes, and to thoſe holy and religious Emperors, which were the nurſing fathers of Gods Church, and pillers to uphold the faith in their dayes. There are extant in the Theodoſian Code many laws cõcerning the Catholike faith; concerning *Biſh. Churches*, and *the Clergy*; concerning *Heretikes*, *Apoſtates*, *Monkes*, *Iewes*, and *Samaritanes*; concerning *Pagan ſacrifices*, and *Temples*; concerning *Religion*, *Epiſcopall judgement*, *thoſe who flee unto Churches*, and many other of the ſame kinde: lawes wholeſome and neceſſary for thoſe times. The like titles are extant alſo in the Code of *Iuſtinian*. In the Authenticks there are I know not how many lawes in the like cauſes: Of *the foure Councels*, *of the Order of Patriarchs*, *of the building of Churches*; *of goods belonging to ſacred places*; *Of the holy Communion*, *of Litanies*, *of the memorials for the dead*, *of the Priviledges of Churches*, *of Patriarchs*, *of the Pope of old Rome*, *of Archbiſhops*, *of Abbots*, *of Presbyters*, *of Deacons*, *of Subdeacons*, *of Monkes*, *of Anchorites*, *of Synods*, *of depoſing Biſhops who fall into hereſie*, *that Patrons who builded Churches*, *and their heyers ſhall nominate the Clerks for the ſame*; *and in caſe they name ſuch as are unmeet*, *then the Biſhop to appoint who he thinks fit*, *that Heretikes ſhall be uncapable of any legacies: and exceeding many the like*. Now ſuch a ſpite hath the Cardinall to the Emperours, and theſe their Imperiall lawes, made concerning the affaires of the Church, that like ſome new *Ariſtarchus*, with one daſh of his pen, hee takes upon him to caſheire, and utterly aboliſh thoſe lawes, (five or ſixe hundreth at the leaſt, with ſuch care, piety, and prudẽce, ſet forth by *Conſtantine*, *Theodoſius*, *Valentinian*, *Gratian*, *Martian*, *Iuſtinian*, and other holy and religious Emperours: And when theſe are gone, whether the Cardinall meant not after them, to wipe away (which with as good reaſon, and authority he may) all the other lawes, which are in the Digeſt, Code, and Authenticks, that ſo his maſter the Pope may play even another Iack Cade, that all law might proceed out of his mouth, let the judicious conſider. This is cleare, that the Cardinals malice is not ſatisfied with reproofe of the lawes themſelves: even theſe holy Emperors *Conſtantine*, *Theodoſius* and the reſt, are, together with *Iuſtinian*, for the making of thoſe lawes touching Eccleſiaſticall affaires and perſons, reproved, nay reviled by *Baronius*, as having beene *preſumptuous perſons*, *authors of an helliſh confuſion in the Church*, *and for turning heaven into hell. They*, *and ſuch as they*, *make lawes of faith? lawes for Biſhops? lawes for the Church?* let them heare, as they well deſerve, and as the * Cardinall ſhameth not to upbraid to *Iuſtinian*, *Ne ultra crepidam*, Sir Cobler goe not beyond you Laſt and Latchet: So indignly doth the Cardinall uſe thoſe holy and religious

* An. 550. nu. 14.

gious Princes, and that even for their zeale to Gods truth and love to his Church, for that which with exceeding piety and prudence they performed to their owne immortall honor, and to the peace and tranquillity of the whole Church of God.

7. His third calumnie is, that hee revileth *Iuſtinian for his ſacrilegious fury and perſecution which hee uſed againſt Pope Vigilius, partly when Vigilius* [h] *was buffeted and beaten at Conſtantinople, before the time of the Councell, and forced to flee to Chalcedon; partly when he was baniſhed* [i] *after the end of the Councell, for not conſenting with the Synod in condemning the Three Chapters.* Alas, how hath hereſie and malice quite blinded the Cardinall, and bereft him of his underſtanding? *Iuſtinian* neither before the Councell, nor after it, perſecuted *Vigilius*. *Vigilius* was neither beaten, nor buffeted, nor fled hee either to Saint *Peter*, or to Saint *Euphemia*, nor was he baniſhed at all; theſe all are nothing but the Poeticall and Chimericall fictions of the Cardinall, no truth, no realty at all in them, as we have before [k] fully demonſtrated. Iudge now I pray you, whether any but ſome *Ajax furioſus*, or who were deprived of his wits, would call the Emperour *madde, franticke, ſacrilegious, poſſeſſed and guided by the Devill, for perſecuting and baniſhing him,* who neither was perſecuted nor baniſhed, but enjoyed the latitude of liberty, and all the benefits thereof, even the Emperours favour, and the comforts accompanying it. But admit *Vigilius* had been baniſhed, as indeed many other Biſhops were, for defending the *Three Chapters* againſt the Decree of the holy generall Councell: was *Iuſtinian* a perſecutor, a monſtrous ſacrilegious perſecutor, for baniſhing or puniſhing condemned heretikes, and Neſtorians? ſuch as all the defenders of the *Three Chapters* to have beene wee have * before declared. what a monſtrous perſecutor then was holy *Conſtantine for baniſhing Theognis* [l] *Biſhop of Nice, and Euſebius Biſhop of Nicomedia, for refuſing to conſent to the Nicene Synod*? What a perſecutor was *Theodoſius* the the elder, who commanded [m] *all that held the Macedonian hereſie to bee baniſhed and ſhut out of their Churches without any hope to recover the ſame againe*? What a perſecutor was *Theodoſius* the younger, who forbad *all men* [n] *to have or reade the bookes of Neſtorius, or to admit the Neſtorians into any City, Towne, Village or houſe*? What an horrible and monſtrous perſecutor was *Martian*, who made a law [o] that *if any ſhould teach the Eutichean hereſie, ultimo ſupplicio coercebitur, he ſhall bee put to death.* If *Conſtantine, Theodoſius* the elder and younger, and *Martian* bee no perſecutors, notwithſtanding this ſeverity in exiling, puniſhing, and putting to death heretikes: what a malicious ſlanderer is *Baronius* for cõdemning *Iuſtinian* as a perſecutor, for baniſhing, impriſoning, or puniſhing with like ſeverity the defẽders of the *three Chapters*, who were every way as deteſtable, as damnable, & as truly convicted & condẽned heretikes, by the judgment of an holy general Councel, as either the *Arians, Macedonians, Eutycheans*, or old *Neſtorians*? Thus to perſecute, that is, juſtly puniſh heretikes, is laudable: thus to be perſecuted is ignominious. *Non eſt peccatum malos perſequi*, [p] ſaith Saint *Auguſtine*, To perſecute and juſtly puniſh wicked men is no offence; *neither are they juſt who are ſo perſecuted, but he who is perſecuted for righteouſneſſe ſake.*

h *Bar. an. 551. 2. et 552. nu. 8.*
i *Bar. an. 553. nu. 221. et 222. &c.*
k *Sup. ca. 16. et 17.*
* *Ca. 4. 5. et ſeq.*
l *Socrat. lib. 1. c. 10.*
m *L. 3 de fide Cath. Cod. Theod.*
n *Leg. ult. de har. Cod. Theod.*
o *Extat in Cont. Chal. Act. 3. pa. 86.*
p *Lib. cont. Fulgent. Donat. ar. 20.*

Had *Iuſtinian* done this to *Vigilius*, hee had beene no perſecutor: But *Vigilius* who oppugned the truth, & *Baronius* who with ſuch a virulent tongue reviles and railes at the defenders of Gods truth; they, and none but they, are perſecutors in this cauſe: They kill not the Prophets nor Apoſtles, but they kill & murther, as cruelly as they can, that truth of God which the Prophets and Apoſtles imbraced, and for defence of which they were ready to bee killed; *This ſpirituall perſecution*, as Saint *Auguſtine* teacheth, [q] *exceeds the corporall: They* [r] *murther the Prophets who contradict the doctrines of the Prophets: Mitius ageretis, It were leſſe crueltie in you to thruſt your ſwords into the bodies of the Prophets, then with your tongues to murther the doctrine and words of the Prophets.* And a thouſand like ſayings hath the ſame *Auguſtine*, by which it were eaſie to demonſtrate *Baronius* himſelfe, and not *Iuſtinian*, to bee the unjuſt, impious, ſacrilegious, and franticke perſecutor, if by that which hath beene ſaid this were not abundantly apparent.

q *Lib. 1. cont. liter. Petil. ca. 27*
r *Aug. lib. 2. cont. lit. Petil. ca. 14.*

8. Now followeth the other Pageant of this *Baronian* Tragedy in declaming againſt *Iuſtinian*. That reſpects his laſt yeares, and his death, in which part, as being the laſt, and therefore likelieſt to leave deepeſt impreſſion in the hearts of the readers, becauſe *Baronius* hath couched together the moſt vile accuſations of all the reſt, and the very venome of his poyſonfull affections, and ſplene, againſt the Emperour, I am moſt unwilling to forſake the religious Emperour in the laſt act of all, but am exceeding deſirous to teſtifie my love unto him, both for other cauſes, and for this eſpecially, that he, next unto God, was the preſerver of the Catholike faith, when in this cauſe of the Three Chapters, the Neſtorians, and eſpecially Pope *Vigilius*, laboured with might and maine for ever to aboliſh and extinguiſh the ſame: in regard of which act alone, if there were none elſe, hee deſerved to bee eternized in the bleſſed memory, and by the beſt indeavors of all that love the Catholike faith. *Baronius* [s] intreating of the 37. yeare of *Iuſtinian*, which was about two yeares before his death, tels us how at that time, *Iuſtinian, Vnhappy Iuſtinian ranne headlong into the hereſie of the Aphthardokites, or incorrupticolæ: who* [t] *denyed the body of CHRIST to bee ſubject to paſſions, death, or corruption:* Theſe, as *Liberatus* ſaith [u], were alſo called *Phantaſticks*, becauſe upon their doctrine it followed, that CHRIST had not a true and truely humane, but onely an imaginary and phantaſticall body. Into this phantaſticall hereſie, ſaith *Baronius*, did *Iuſtinian* fall, and runne headlong in his laſt age: and for proofe hereof hee alleageth [x] moſt ample witneſſes: *Authores omnes tam Graci quam Latini*, All Authors both Greeke and Latine, *they all teſtifie that hee fell into this hereſie; and they deteſt that impiety in him*; Nor did he onely fall himſelfe into it, but hee ſought to draw all others into the ſame errour: *Ita ebrius* [y] *factus eſt, ut mente motus*, Iuſtinian *was ſo drunke, that being out of his wits, hee writ an Edict* [z] *to confirme that hereſie, and bring all the Church to beleeve the ſame:* When hee prevailed not that way, then hee began [a] to uſe violence, *Exilium omnibus Epiſcopis contradicentibus comminatur*, hee threatned baniſhment to all the Biſhops who contradicted

s *An. 563. nu. 1.*
t *Evagr. lib. 4. ca. 38. Leont. lib. de ſect. Act. 10. et Praedeſt. de Hæreſ. har. 35. Dicebant carnem quam ex virgine Servator aſſumpſit, ante paſſionem, incorruptibilem fuiſſe.*
u *Liberat. Brev. ca. 19.*
x *An. 563. nu. 8.*
y *Bar. ibid. nu. 9*
z *Illud conſtat, Imperatorem hæreſin comprobaſſe eandemque ſcripto Edicto firmaſſe. An. 564. nu. 3.*
a *An. 563. nu. 12*

dicted that hereſie, *and* [b] *ſo boyling in rage, raiſed a perſecution, yea, Perſecutionem* [c] *haud mediocrem, an heavy and great perſecution againſt Catholike Biſhops, caſting* Eutychius *Biſhop of Conſtantinople into baniſhment for this cauſe.* Thus *Baronius.* Who proves this concerning the Edict and perſecution, partly by the *Surian Euſtathius* [d], who writ the life of *Eutychius*, partly out of *Evagrius*, [e] who both mention indeed the baniſhment of *Eutychius*, and the Edict of *Iuſtinian*, written for that hereſie.

b *Vbi elaboratũ à ſe edictũ contemni ab orthodoxis percepit, ira exæſtuans, magnam perſequutionem commovit. an. 564. nu. 1.*
c *Ibid. nu. 2.*
d *Bar. ibid. extant vero apud Sur. die 6. Apr.*
e *Lib. 4. cã. 38.*

9. This is the ſumme of that which is objected: but how *Baronius* doth amplifie, decke, and paint out the ſame by his Rhetorication, is not unworthy obſerving. He not onely taxeth this in *Iuſtinian* as an act of curioſity, [f] temerity, and arrogancy, for *His intermedling in ſacred matters*, and of fooliſhneſſe, for *Partaking* [g] *with the one ſide in the faction, as he had done with the* Praſini, for which he [h] calleth him, *Maximum jurium proculcatorem*, The greateſt deſpiſer and trampler of lawes under his feet; but he cals him alſo *Meute motũ*, [i] a man out of his wits, an *hereteike*, [l] *another Ægyptian* Pharaoh, [m] *who bent all his power to oppreſſe the Catholike faith*; *yea a very Antichriſt*, ſaying thus [n] of him, *Iuſtinian no otherwiſe than Antichriſt, ſetting up his Chaire and Throne in the Temple of God, and extolling himſelfe above all that is worſhipped, maketh ſacrilegious lawes for eſtabliſhing Infidelity, and writes Edicts for hereſie:* And againe, *not* • *any reaſon, but onely the Emperours authority, did erect that hereſie*, *Tanquam Idolum in Templo Dei*, As an Idoll in the Temple of God. Whereupon the Cardinall [p] in the anguiſh of his heart, takes up with ſighes and teares the complaint of *Ieremy*, *O heavens be aſtoniſhed at this, be afraid and utterly aſtoniſhed, the Emperor hath forſaken the fountaine of living waters, & he hath digged to himſelfe pits that will hold no water*. After this fit of his weeping overpaſt, he then comes to the moſt baſe reviling & railing againſt the Emperor, calling [q] him *Monſtrũ triceps*, that Monſter with three heads (like another *Cerberus*, or hell-hound) *which Eccleſiaſticus* [r] *ſpeaks of, & declares to be ſo odious & execrable: A poore man proud, a rich man a lyar, and an old man a foole. Such a Monſter*, ſaith he, *did Iuſtinian now appeare*, (*like three-bodied Gerion, in the Poets*,) *ſeeing he joyned theſe three deteſtable faults in himſelfe at this time. Hee was poore, yea moſt poore, Expers penitus literarum*, Vtterly voyd of learning, *not able to reade his very A.b.c. and yet hee would ſeeme to be more learned than all Biſhops: ſo he was a poore man proud. He was alſo a rich man, a lyar, in that he commanded all to embrace hereſie, and by his power hindreth them to contradict his Edict: like him of whom it is ſaid,* [t] *The rich man ſpake, and all held their peace. Laſtly, when he refuſed the counſell of the Elders, Planè ſenex cognitus eſt fatuus & inſenſatus*, He was therein plainly knowne to be an old doting foole, without wit or ſenſe. Thus *Baronius*: concluding that Emperour to be a monſter, an heretike, a hell-hound, a mad man, a lyar, a blockhead, and a very plaine foole: whom all the Chriſtian world hath, and ſhall for ever, and that moſt juſtly, admire for his piety, prudence, and wiſedome.

f *An. 563. nu. 1. & 6.*
g *Praſinũ eum ſtulte ſtuduiſſe meminimus. an. 563. nu. 2.*
h *An. 558. nu. 13.*
i *an. 563. 9.*
l *an. 565. nu. 1.*
m *an. 564. nu. 21.*
n *an. 563. nu. 6.*
o *an. 564 nu. 1.*
p *an. 563. nu. 6.*
q *Ibid. nu. 7.*
r *Eccl. 25.*
t *Eccl. 13.*

10. *Baronius*, not content with this ſo uncivill demeanour, tells us further what miſchiefes enſued upon theſe deteſtable crimes of the Emperour. Thoſe are of two ſorts: the former is publique, concern-

ing

u *An.563. nu.1* ing both the Eccleſiaſticall and civill State. For the Church, u *pacem profligat, Iuſtinian* drove away peace and quiet from it: *he endangered, atque tandem penitus labefactat fidem*, and at laſt utterly ſubverted and
x *An.565.nu.1.* overthrew the faith. For the Common wealth, it did x *titubare*, reele and decline into a worſe eſtate, *under this hereticall Emperour*, whom he
y *An.550.nu.14* y accuſeth, *frigeſcere*, to have beene cold and careleſſe *in the government of the Empire*. The other miſchiefe, which is private, concernes *Iuſtinian* himſelfe. For the Cardinalls hatred to *Iuſtinian* is not ſatiate with the evils of this life, he purſues him εἰδὸτα πυλῶν, and ſitting in the
z *Opinari ſi cui licet, facilius eſt invenire qui Evagrij de ejus condemnatione velit ſequi ſententiam, quam aliorum, &c. an.565.nu.6.* chayre of *Radamanthus*, he approves z and applauds that moſt raſh and undiſcreet judgement of *Evagrius*, a *ad ſupplicia apud inferos luenda profectus eſt*, hee is gone to be tormented in hell. Yea the Cardinall proves b that he went thither in this manner; *Although it be not in mans power to bee preſent at Gods judgement, and it be utterly unlawfull to judge of the dead; yet according to that irrevocable ſentence of God, which is pronoũced of all the dead,** Their works follow them, according to this ſentence, *eadem ipſa quæ hinc abeuntem ſequuta ſunt Iuſtinianũ*, thoſe ſame workes which followed *Iuſtinian* when hee dyed, *doe as yet crie againſt him in bookes*: and thoſe are *juge bellum*, his perpetuall warre againſt the Church, *which hee continually nouriſhed, (having baniſhed peace which he found therein) and when hee dyed left it in a flame: his unmeaſurable* c *Sacrilegies, laying oftentimes his violent hands upon holy Biſhops, the annointed of the Lord: his cruelty againſt innocent Citizens: his covetouſneſſe, and the reſt*, which I omit. Thus *Baronius*: who plainly telling us, that theſe ſo many, ſo heinous crimes, and crying ſinnes, followed *Iuſtinian* out of this life, (and every man knowes that theſe follow no whither but unto hell) hee moſt forcibly concludeth, that *Iuſtinian* out of all doubt, was carried hence to be tormented in thoſe helliſh flames. Never could the Cardinall bee at quiet, till beſides all thoſe other reviling and diſgracefull ignominies which hee hath heaped upon *Iuſtinian*, he had brought him into the pit and torments of hell: And yet not there alſo will the Cardinall ſuffer him to be at reſt, but like a Fiend or Fury, hee ſtill exagitates the Emperour with his virulent tongue and ſtile, worſe than any of all the infernall Ghoſts; neither alive nor dead will the Cardinall ceaſe to torment him.

a *Lib.5.ca.1.*
b *An.565.nu.6.*
* *Apoc.4.*
c *Sacrilegiorum immenſitas. Bar. Ibid.*

11. Verily I know not where either to begin or make an end in this matter, nor how it is poſſible for any man with ſufficient gravity and ſeverity to caſtigate the Cardinals inſolent, inhumane, unchriſtian demenour againſt the moſt renowned and religious Emperour. Did any of thoſe worthy profeſſours of the civill lawes, but halfe ſo much abound with leaſure, as they doe with excellency of wit and learning, I doubt not but they would (as I doe heartily wiſh) undertake ſo honourable a ſervice, not onely to *Iuſtinian*, but unto GOD and his Church, as in a juſt volume to vindicate the Emperours honour from theſe ſo many, ſo malicious, ſo baſe & immodeſt calũnies of this *Rhabſecha*. A worke not very laborious, ſeeing as on the Emperours part there is ſuch abundant ſtore and variety of all vertues and praiſe-worthy actions to ſet forth his honour, as no mans ſtile nor words can equall or come neare the ſame: ſo on *Baronius* part, with whom hee is

to

to contend, there are ſo many ſhameleſſe and deteſtable untruths, either deviſed, or applauded by him, that *Voraginenſis* himſelfe may ſeeme inferiour to him in this kinde; and I much doubt, whether ſo many voluminous bookes, as might equall any two Tomes of his Annals, could bee able to comprehend them all: Meane while that I ſeeme not to ſhuffle this burden from mine own to other mens ſhoulders, I will, with their good leave, I hope, adde ſomewhat out of thoſe bookes which concerne my own profeſſion, and out of my ſhallow reading indeavour to free the Emperour from thoſe moſt diſhonorable imputations of the Cardinall.

12. Let us then begin with that which is the ſubſtance and ground of this whole accuſation, and that is, *The Emperours ſuppoſed falling into hereſie, and writing that hereticall Edict:* This if we can prove to bee a ſlander and untruth, all the reſt, which the Cardinall builds upon this, and derives from it, will of themſelves fall to the ground. Firſt then I doe conſtantly avouch that imputation of hereſie to bee untrue: *Iuſtinian* neither held that fantaſticall hereſie of the *Aphthardokites*, nor made any Edict for the defence or propagating thereof, nor did hee baniſh or perſecute any Orthodoxall Biſhop for contradicting that hereſie: All theſe are ſlanderous untruths which the Cardinall hath collected out of others, and maliciouſly uttered in diſgrace of the Emperour: And truly, that very contradiction which is not onely in other writers, but in the Cardinall himſelfe, in ſetting downe this narration, is no ſmall preſumption of the untruth thereof. [d] *Evagrius* and *Nicephorus* [e] expreſly witneſſe, that the Emperours Edict was not at all publiſhed. *Theophanes* [f], (as the Cardinall cals him, or *Paulus Diaconus* as others,) and after him *Sixtus Senenſis* [g], expreſly witneſſe the contrary, that his Edict *was divulged, & ubique tranſmiſſum*, and ſent to every place. *Baronius*, not knowing whether was truer, affirmeth them both, though they be expreſly contradictory: Firſt, that he did publiſh the Edict, the Cardinall teacheth, [h] ſaying, *Iuſtinian when he ſaw his Edict, contemni ab Orthodoxis, & pro nihilo duci*; to bee contemned and ſet at nought by the Orthodoxall Biſhops, *then hee raiſed his perſecution*. How could that Edict be contemned, unleſſe it had been publiſhed & ſet forth for an Edict? or how could they be baniſhed for gainſaying that Edict, which if it was not publiſhed, had not the force of an Edict? Againe, that hee did not publiſh it, the [i] Cardinall likewiſe tels us, *Hee writ indeed, Non tamen promulgavit de hæreſi Edictum*, But hee did not publiſh that Edict. Hee did publiſh it: hee did not publiſh it: what truth in thoſe witneſſes who thus contradict themſelves? If he did publiſh it, as the Cardinals *Theophanes*, and *Sixtus Senenſis* affirme, then *Evagrius*, and *Nicephorus*, are not herein to bee credited: If hee did not publiſh it, how is the Cardinals *Theophanes*, or *Senenſis* herein to be credited? And whether hee did publiſh it, or not publiſh it, the Cardinall who teacheth both, is certainly herein not to bee credited. This diſagreement of the witneſſes one with another, and of *Baronius* with his one ſelfe, is no good ſigne of truth in their Narration.

13. But that *Iuſtinian* neither publiſhed nor writ any ſuch Edict, nor

d *Iuſtiniani Edictum minimè divulgatum eſt.* Lib 4. ca. 40.
e *Scriptum id, editum non eſt.* Lib. 17. ca. 30.
f *Hiſt. miſcel. lib.* 16. *an.* 38. *Juſtin.*
g *Iuſtin. præcepit hoc dogma à ſacerdotibus publicè doceri, et ab omni plebe recipi.* Lib. 5. Bibl. annot. 186.
h *An.* 564. *nu.* 1
i *An.* 565. *nu.* 4.

nor held any ſuch phantaſticke hereſie, a farre more faithfull witneſſe than any of the former, even *Victor* B. of Tunen, who lived in that ſame time at Conſtantinople, and who would have triumphed to have had ſo juſt an occaſion to reprove & diſgrace the Emperor, by whom he was impriſoned and baniſhed, doth make evident. Hee [k] plainly ſheweth how *Iuſtinian* continued conſtant in defence of his owne Edict, for condemning the Three Chapters, and of the ſynodall Iudgement given therein, even to his death. In his 38. *yeare* (the very next to that wherein *Baronius* fancieth him to have fallen into hereſie,) Hee *ſent for foure Africane and two Ægyptian Biſhops*, and both perſonally by himſelfe, as alſo by ſome others, he laboured to draw them to the orthodox faith, in condemning with him, and the fift Synod, the Three Chapters: and when he could not prevaile, *Cuſtodiæ mittuntur*, they were put into priſon. In the next yeare, he ſaith that [l] *Iuſtinian placed Iohn a condemner of the Three Chapters in the See of Conſtantinople, Eutychius being baniſhed:* and to his very dying day, he kept *Theodorus* Biſhop of Cabarſuſſus in baniſhment, *becauſe he would not condemne the Three Chapters.* So orthodoxall was *Iuſtinian*, and ſo earneſt an oppugner of hereſies, of thoſe eſpecially which deny either the true humanity, or the true Godhead of Chriſt, even till his very death, by the certaine teſtimony of *Victor*, an eager enemy of *Iuſtinian*. Seeing then he continued conſtant till his death, in condemning the Three Chapters, and maintaining his owne Edict for the condemning of them: and ſeeing the condemning of them, or the defence of that Edict is the defence of the true faith, [m] and an oppugnation of all hereſies, which deny either the Divinity or Humanity in Chriſt, ſpecially of that of the Phantaſticks, or Aphthardokites, as the very words [n] of his Edict doe declare; it clearly hence followeth from the certaine teſtimony of *Victor*, that *Iuſtinian* was ſo farre from embracing, or making Edicts for that hereſie, that he conſtantly oppugned the ſame, and even puniſhed all who beleeved or taught as the Aphthardokites did; for in beleeving that hereſie, they contradicted the Emperours owne Edict, and the holy Councels, both at Nice, Conſtantinople, Epheſus, and Chalcedon: all [o] which the Emperour by this Edict, even untill his death conſtantly maintained.

14. Why, but *All Writers*, ſaith *Baronius*, [m] *both Greeke and Latine, they all doe teſtifie that Iuſtinian fell into that hereſie.* What heare I? Doe *All*, and *All, both Greeke and Latine?* doe they *All teſtifie this of Iuſtinian?* A vaſt, a ſhameleſſe, a Cardinall, a very Baronian untruth! Of the Greekes, not *Procopius*, not *Agathias*, not *Photius*, not *Damaſcen*, though he entreat [u] of this very hereſie; not the Cardinals owne *Suidas*, who quite contrary to the Cardinall calls *Iuſtinian* Ὀρθοδοξότατον, *a moſt Catholique and Orthodoxall Emperour.* Of the Latines, not *Victor*, by whom as you have ſeene, the cleane contrary is alſo teſtified: not *Liberatus*; and both theſe lived at the ſame time with *Iuſtinian:* not *Marcellinus:* not *Bede:* not *Anaſtaſius*, though ſuch was his ſplene againſt *Iuſtinian*, that he could not have concealed ſuch a diſgracefull crime: not *Aimonius*, of whom I pray you ſee how well his teſtimony accordeth with the Cardinall: *Iuſtinian*, ſaith [o] he, *was a man fide Catholicus, pietate inſignis,*

k *Vict. Tun. in Chron.*

l *An. Juſt. 39.*

m *Neceſſarium putavimus, rectæ fidei confeſſionem quæ in ſancta Dei Eccleſia prædicatur præſenti edicto facere manifeſtam. Edict. Iuſt. pa. 492.*

n *Ieſus Chriſtus eſt conſubſtantialis Patri ſecundum Deitatem, conſubſtantialis nobis ſecundum Humanitatem, paſſibilis carne, impaſſibilis deitate. ibid. &, Vtraq; natura in proprietate & ratione naturæ ſuæ manente, facta eſt unitas ſecundum ſubſtantiam. ibid.*

o *Hæc cum univerſali Eccleſia confitentes: eandem confeſſionem conſervamus, quam 318. Patres in Nicea collecti, tradiderunt: & poſt illos, 150. ſancti Patres, Conſtantinopoli explanaverunt: &, qui in Epheſo & qui Chalcedone convenêre docuerunt. ibid. pa. 495.*

m *an. 563. nu. 8.*

n *Lib. de hæreſ.*

o *De geſt. Franc. lib. 3. ca. 8.*

ſignis, aquitatis cultor egregius: for his faith, Catholike; for his piety, renowned; a marvellous lover of equitie, and therefore all things did cooperate to his good: & he addeth, for the whole time of his Empire, (which was 39. yeares) *Imperium felici ſorte rexit*, Hee governed the Empire in an happy manner: Not the true *Paulus Diaconus* [p], who uſing the like words, ſaith, that *Iuſtinian governed the Empire in an happy* [q] *ſort, & was Prince for his faith Catholike, in his actions upright, in judgements juſt: and therefore all things concurred to his good:* not *Sigebert*, not *Marianus Scotus*, not *Lambertus Scafnaburgenſis*, not *Ado Viennenſis*, not *Albo Floriacenſis*, not *Luitprandus*, not *Conrad Abbas Vſpergenſis*, not *Albertus Stadenſis*, not *Otho Friſingenſis*, who cals [r] him *Chriſtianiſſimum ac pijſſimum Principem*, a moſt Chriſtian, and moſt pious Prince, (unfit epethetes for an heretike, or one condemned to the torments of hell) not *Gotofrid Viterbienſis* [s], who likewiſe calls him *a moſt Chriſtian Prince, one who eſtabliſhed peace in the Church, which rejoyced under him to enjoy tranquillitie*: not *Wernerus*, whoſe teſtimonie is worthy obſerving, to ſee the Cardinals faith and true dealing in this cauſe: *Iuſtinian*, ſaith hee *, *was in all things moſt excellent, for in him did concurre three things which make a Prince glorious, to wit, power, by which hee overcame his enemies; wiſedome, by which hee governed the world with juſt lawes; and a religious minde to Gods worſhip, by which hee glorified God, and beautified the Churches*: So farre is he from teaching him with the Cardinall, to have beene a Tartarean *Cerberus*, or Three-headed monſter, conſiſting of three deteſtable vices, that he oppoſeth thereunto a Trinity of three moſt renowned vertues, Fortitude, Iuſtice, and Piety, of which the Emperour was compoſed: Not *Nauclerus*, not *Krantzius*, not *Tritemius*, not *Papirius Maſſonus*, not *Chriſtianus Maſſeus*, not the *Magnum Cronicum Belgicum*: not the *Chronicon Reicherſpergenſe*, which [t] teſtifieth, *that he did performe many things profitable to the Common-wealth, and ſo ended his life*: Not *Munſter*, who [t] ſaith of him, that *hee was a juſt and upright man in finding out matters ingenious, Atque hareſum maximus hoſtis*, and the greateſt enemy of hereſies: not *Platina*, who [u] ſaith of *Iuſtinus*, the next Emperour unto him, hee was *Nulla in re ſimilis Iuſtiniano*, in nothing like unto *Iuſtinian*, *For hee was covetous wicked, ravenous, a contemner both of God and men*: whence it followeth, that *Iuſtinian* was quite contrary, bountifull, juſt, religious, an honourer both of God and good men.

[p] Lib. 1. de Geſt. Longob. ca. 25.
[q] Felici ſorte.
[r] Lib. 5. ca. 4.
[s] Chron. in Juſt.
* An. 504.
[t] An. 564.
[t] Coſmog. lib. 4. in Iuſtin.
[u] In vita Iob. 3.

15. Now whereas all theſe (and I know not how many more, I thinke an hundred at leaſt, if one were curious in this ſearch) doe write of *Iuſtinian*, and not one of them, for ought that after earneſt ſearch I can finde, doe mention his fall in that fantaſticke hereſie; nay, many of them, as you have ſeene, doe teſtifie on the contrary, that hee was and continued a Catholike, a religious, a moſt pious, a moſt Chriſtian, a moſt orthodoxall Prince, and the greateſt oppugner of hereſies: what an audacious and ſhameleſſe untruth was it in the Cardinall, to ſay, that, *All Authors, all, both Greeke and Latine, doe witneſſe and deteſt his impiety, and his fall into that hereſie*. Beſides theſe, I muſt yet adde ſome other, and thoſe alſo farre more eminent and ample witneſſes, who doe more than demonſtrate both the honour of *Iuſtinian*, and

thoſe

thoſe imputations of hereſie, and the other diſgraces wherewith *Baronius* hath loaded him, to bee moſt ſhameleſſe calumnies and ſlanders.

16. The firſt of theſe is Pope *Agatho*, one of their [x] Canonized Saints: Hee in his [y] Epiſtle to the Emperour *Conſtantine Pogonatus*, to prove out of the venerable * Fathers two natures to be in Chriſt, tels us, that S. *Cyril*, Saint *Chryſoſtome*, *Iohn* Biſhop of *Scithopolis*, *Eulogius* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, *Ephremius* and *Anaſtaſius* the elder, two moſt worthy Biſhops of *Antioch*, *& præ omnibus*, *amulator veræ & Apoſtolicæ fidei*, *piæ memoriæ Iuſtinianus Auguſtus*, & above all theſe *Iuſtinian* the Emperour of holy memory, a zealous defender of the true and Apoſtolicall faith, teacheth this, *whoſe integrity of faith did as much exalt the Chriſtian Common-wealth, as by the ſincerity therof it was pleaſing unto God: and whoſe religious memory, ab omnibus gentibus veneratione digna cenſetur*, is eſteemed by all nations worthy of veneration. *ſeeing the integrity of his faith, ſet out by his Imperiall Edicts, in toto orbe diffuſa laudatur*, is ſpred abroad and praiſed in the whole world. Thus Saint *Agatho*: Whoſe words may juſtly cauſe all the Cardinals friends to bluſh and bee aſhamed of his Annals. Saint *Agatho* rankes *Iuſtinian* among the venerable and holy Fathers of the Church: *Baronius* thruſts him among heretikes, Saint *Agatho* preferres him before Saint *Cyrill*, Saint *Chryſoſtome*, *Eulogius*, *Iohn* and *Ephremius*, all learned and worthy Biſhops: *Baronius* debaſeth him below the moſt rude and illiterate perſons, even below any abcedary Scholler, and cals him a very blocke and a foole: Saint *Agatho* preferres him to that very *Anaſtaſius* the elder, * ſurnamed *Sinaita*, becauſe hee came from the wilderneſſe of *Sinai*, whom for maintaining the faith againſt this very hereſie of the *Aphthardokites*, *Evagrius* [a], and *Baronius* [b] himſelfe, cals *turrim munitiſſimam*, a moſt ſtrong towre; and yet (as Saint *Agatho* witneſſeth) a more worthy and defenſed towre of faith was our *Iuſtinian*: *Baronius* [c] makes him and this *Anaſtaſius* to bee contradictory in faith, and *Iuſtinian* to threaten baniſhment unto this *Anaſtaſius* for not conſenting to the hereſie of the Phantaſticks: S. *Agatho* commends him for his integrity & ſincerity in maintaining the true and Apoſtolicall faith: *Baronius* condemnes him for an Antichriſt, an execrable and hereticall oppugner, yea, perſecutor of the Apoſtolicall faith: S. *Agatho* teſtifieth that the ſincerity of his faith did both pleaſe God, and highly exalt the Church and Empire: *Baronius* revileth him, as odious to God, deteſtable to men, and pernicious, yea, peſtiferous both to Church and Empire: S. *Agatho* witneſſeth his memory to bee pious, bleſſed and venerable, and that in all nations: *Baronius* declames againſt him as accurſed, and abominable to all: S. *Agatho* proclameth, that all nations, and the whole world doth conſent in the praiſing of the faith, and veneration of the perſon of *Iuſtinian*: *Baronius* tels you, that all Authors, both Greeke and Latine, conſent in condemning the faith, and deteſting the hereſie of *Iuſtinian*. *Vtri creditis?* whether doe you beleeve *Baronius* malicioufly applauding an untruth, which hee found in one or two writers, of none, or little credit, or *Agatho* a Pope, a Saint, with whom conſent all nations, and the whole world?

x *Martyrol. Rom. Ian. 10.*
y *Agath. Epiſt. extat Act. 4. Concil. Gen. 6.*
z *Non deſunt autem et aliorũ venerabilium patrum probatiſſima teſtimonia, &c. Ibid.*

* *Nam Anaſtaſius minor Epiſcopatum adeptus eſt poſt mortem Iuſtiniani ut ex Niceph. Conſtant. in Chro. liquet.*

a *Lib. 4. ca. 39.*
b *An. 563. 10.*
c *Ibid. nu. 12.*

17. To

17. To Pope *Agatho* I adjoyne the whole Romane Synod conſiſting of 125. Biſhops, who all together with *Agatho* give the like honorable teſtimony of *Iuſtinian*. They with *Agatho* writ a Synodall [d] letter to the ſame Emperour *Conſtantine*, wherein they exhort him to imitate the piety and vertue of *Conſtantine, of Theodoſius, of Martian, and of Iuſtinian the great, extremi quidem, præſtantiſſimi tamen omnium*, the laſt indeed (of thoſe who had before aſſembled generall Councells) but the moſt excellent of them all, *whoſe piety and vertue omnia in meliorem ſtatum reſtauravit*, reſtored all things into a better order. Thus that whole Synod: Could they more forcibly have demonſtrated *Baronius* to be a ſlanderer? *Baronius* ſaith that *Iuſtinian* was an heretike, a perſecutor, an Antichriſt, one who diſſipated the faith, ruinated the Empire, brought an helliſh confuſion into the Church: for which crimes hee placeth him among the damned in hell. Pope *Agatho* with his whole Councell, teſtifie, that by his piety and vertue hee reſtored all; both the Church and Empire into a better order: they honour him (as much, nay more than they do S. *Conſtantine* *, or *Theodoſius*, or *Martian*,) for one of the moſt renowned upholders of the faith of *Chriſt*, for one of them, who at their death did not leave nor loſe, but onely exchange their imperiall Crowne, and in ſtead of their earthly and corruptible, received the celeſtiall and immarceſſible Diadem of immortality and eternall glory: among theſe, yea and above theſe Saints and glorified Emperours, as being *moſt excellent of them all*, is *Iuſtinian* placed and crowned in heaven, by the judgement of Saint *Agatho* and his whole Councell with him.

d Extat Epiſt. Act. 4. Conc. 6. pa. 21.

* Sanctum Conſtantinum, vocat Papa Steph. in Epiſt. ad Baſil. imperat. poſt 8. Synod.

18. If yet you require more or more ample witneſſes, behold, the ſixt generall Councell hath approved both thoſe Epiſtles of *Agatho*. Of them the whole Synod [e] ſaid, *Petrus per Agathonem loquutus eſt*; *Peter* ſpake by the mouth of *Agatho*: and againe, [f] *We all conſent to the dogmaticall letters of Agatho, & to the ſuggeſtion of the holy Synod which was under him, of* 125. *Biſhops*. Of them *Conſtantine* [g] ſaith in the name of the whole Councell, *Omnes conſonanter mente & lingua*, wee all with one heart and voyce *beleeve and profeſſe, and admire the relation of Agatho; as the divine voyce of Saint Peter*. Of them [i] *Domitius* B. of Pruſias ſayd; *I receive and imbrace the ſuggeſtions of the moſt bleſſed Agatho, tanquam ex Spiritu Sancto dictatas, as being inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, and uttered by the mouth of Saint Peter, and written with the fingers of Agatho*. Thus doth the whole generall Councell approve thoſe Epiſtles of *Agatho*: which their approbation not onely *Bellarmine* [k], but *Baronius* [l] himſelfe extendeth to every part and parcell of thoſe Epiſtles, ſaying of them; *In omnibus tum ipſe Conſtantinus, tam ſancta Synodus ſuſcepit*; both *Conſtantine* & the holy Councell received theſe in all & every point. And againe, [m] *Epiſtolæ Roma miſſæ in omnibus comprobatæ dicuntur*, The Epiſtles of *Agatho*, which were ſent from Rome are ſaid to be approved in All things ſet downe therein. Now ſeeing the whole generall Councell, by *Baronius* owne confeſſion, doth in this ſort approve the Epiſtles of *Agatho*, and therefore thoſe very teſtimonies concerning *Iuſtinians* faith, piety, honour, and eternall bleſſedneſſe in Heaven: had not *Baronius*, thinke you, a face more hard than braſſe or adamant,

e In Sermon. proſphon. Act. 18 pa. 89.
f Ibid. & Act. 15 8. 6.
g Act. 18. pa. 93.
i Act. 8. pa. 29.
k Bell. lib. 4. de Pontif. ca. 11. § Vbi et, Ati. an. 681. nu. 24
m an. eod. nu. 49

when he reviled in ſo immodeſt manner that Emperour, as an heretike, a perſequutor of the faith, an Antichriſt, a drunken, frantick, and ſacrilegious foole, a ruinater of the Church, and careleſſe governour of the Empire, yea as one condemned and now tormented in hell, and who ſealeth it with this ſaying, That his hereſie is teſtified by *All authors*? whereas thoſe moſt honourable teſtimonies of Pope *Agatho*, and the Romane Synod with him, (which declare *Iuſtinian* to have beene for faith orthodoxall, for vertue and piety renowned, and held in veneration by all nations, and praiſed of all the world, and to have beene equall, nay more excellent than Saint *Conſtantine*, *Theodoſius*, and *Martian*, and therefore to be both in his owne perſon, and in his memory bleſſed) are approved, and that in this very point, as *Baronius* acknowledgeth, by the ſixt generall Councell to be as certaine and as true, as if Saint *Peter*, or the Holy Ghoſt had uttered the ſame. Said I not truly, that this cauſe of the Three Chapters had bereft the Cardinall, not onely of truth, but of judgement, of modeſty, of civility, yea almoſt of common ſenſe, ſo that he cares not what he ſayes, ſo he ſpeake in defence of thoſe who defend, and in condemnation of thoſe who condemne the Three Chapters, though he knoweth that, which he ſaith, to be teſtified to be a calumny and ſlander, not onely by hiſtorians and private writers, but by the Pope, by the Romane Synod, by the holy generall Councel, that is, by the whole Catholike Church, by all Nations, by the whole world, by Saint *Peter*, and by the Holy Ghoſt himſelfe.

19. There might be added unto theſe, divers other pregnant teſtimonies, of Pope *Gregory*, who often calls [k] *Iuſtinian*, a man *Piæ memoriæ*, of a pious memory; of the Legates of *Agatho*, who call [l] him, *of divine memory*; of *Peter* B. of Nicomedia and others, who call [m] him of *bleſſed remembrance*; of the Emperour *Conſtantinus*, who calls [n] him, *divinæ memoriæ*; of the ſixt generall Councell, which not ſo little as a dozen times I thinke, [o] calls him of *pious, or divine memory*, *moſt holy Iuſtinian*, or the like; and which, to expreſſe that great honour which they aſcribe to the religious Emperour then preſent before them, (whom they terme the driver away of heretikes,) proclame him to be *a new Conſtantine*, *a new Theodoſius*, *a new Martian*, *a new Iuſtinian*, crying out in his honour in divers [p] actions, *Novo Iuſtiniano æterna memoria*, eternall memory bee to you our new *Iuſtinian*. A miſerable prayſe and wiſh had this beene, had *Iuſtinian* beene an Heretike, a Perſecutor, an Antichriſt, a damned perſon in hell: for then the whole generall Councell had not onely diſhonoured *Conſtantine* there preſent, but had wiſhed honour and immortall glory to Heretikes, to Perſecutors, to Antichriſt, yea to the Devill himſelfe: which kinde of prayſing and praying, is not very ſutable to the piety and faith of that generall Councell. But the former teſtimonies are ſo ample and illuſtrious, that they ſeeme to me to obſcure all theſe and the like, and doe ſo abundantly convince *Baronius* to ſlander and calumniate the Emperour, that I will forbeare to preſſe him with any more.

k *Lib.1.Ind.11 Epiſt.10.& lib. 3.Epiſt 4.*
l *Con.6.act.3.*
m *Act.10.*
n *Act.18.*
o *Act.14.& 18*
p *Act.8.& 16. & 17. & 18.*

20. Perhaps ſome good friends of *Baronius* will ſay in his behalfe, and for his excuſe, that hee did not deviſe this of himſelfe, nor is hee the

the firſt that accuſeth *Iuſtinian* of this Hereſie: he hath his Books, and his Authors for him. He hath ſo indeed. And ſo he hath *Neſtorius* and *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia* for his defending *Neſtorianiſm*. He deviſed not that neither of himſelf, he doth but ſecõd others therin. By this apology whõ may not the Cardinal revile when he liſt? He may calumniate *Athanaſius for a* [l] *murderer*; *Celeſtine and Cyril for* [m] *Apolinarians*; *Conſtantine the great for a* [n] *perſecutor of the true faith*; for which crime his ſon is called *an Hereticke, a murderer, a friend of the Devill*: Saint *Paul for a* [o] *ſeditious and peſtilent fellow, a* [p] *mad man*: Chriſt himſelfe for a *glutton* [q] *and drunkard, a man poſſeſſed* [r] *by the devill, a* [s] *blaſphemer*. Thus may he revile and accuſe theſe, and al the beſt men that have ever been in the world, yea even God himſelfe, and then ſalve all with this plaiſter; Why, *Baronius* deviſeth not any one of theſe imputations, hee can produce his books & authors for thẽ all: and thoſe alſo far better than he doth for this concerning *Iuſtinian*. In one he hath the whole Councell of Tyre; in another, *Iohn* Patriarch of Antioch, *Theodoret*, & the Councel which they held at Epheſus; in a third, *Lucifer* Biſhop of Calaris, a Confeſſor, one who ſuffered whippings and tortures at the Councell of Millan, and after that, exile for the faith: in another, *Tertullus* and *Feſtus*: in the laſt, the Iewes, the Scribes, and the High Prieſt with his Councell: would this excuſe either *Baronius*, or any that ſhould upbraid theſe crimes unto *Athanaſius*, *Conſtantine*, *Paul*, or *Chriſt*, from being revilers and ſlanderers. He who applaudeth & abetteth a ſlander, (as doth *Baronius* this of *Iuſtinian*) he is as guilty of ſlander as if himſelfe had deviſed it. The law of God doth not only ſay, Thou ſhalt not lye or deviſe a falſe tale, but [t] *Thou ſhalt not receive a falſe tale, neither ſhalt thou put thine hand* w^th^ *the wicked* (not be a coadjutor, an acceſſary, or an abetter) *to be a falſe witneſſe*. Yea though many report an untruth, yet their multitude cannot excuſe thee: *Thou* [u] *ſhalt not follow a multitude in doing evill; neither ſhalt thou agree in a controverſie to decline after many, and overthrow the truth*. And the Apoſtles rule [x] condemnes not onely *thoſe who doe evill themſelves, but thoſe alſo* (and that much more) *who conſent unto, or who favour thoſe that doe evill*: accordingly whereunto S. *Ierome* [y] ſaith of wantonneſſe, that which is true in all other ſins, *majori procacitate defendunt libidinem quam exercent*, it is a greater impudency to defend luſt, lying, ſlandering, or any ſin, than to commit it.

l Conc. Tyrium apud Athan. Apol. 2.
m Conciliab. Iobannis, Epheſ. ſup. ca. 11. nu. 42.
n Quia voluerit eſſe Arianus, idcirco Athanaſium peroſum habuit a Patre tuo, non te fugit. Lucif. lib. 1. pro Athan. pa. 57.
o Princeps hæreticus, deinde, perſecutor, &c. et, amici tui diaboli, ait idem Conſtantino. ibid. pa. 12. et 13.
p Tertullus, Act. 24. 5.
q Feſtus, Act. 26. 24.
r Matth. 11 19.
s Mark 3. 22.
t Matth. 26. 65.
t Exod. 23. 1.
u Ibid v. 2.
x Rom. 1. 32.
y Lib. 2. adverſ. Iovin.

21. But let us ſee who thoſe are on whoſe report the Card. frames this his ſlanderous invective againſt the Emperor. He ſaith they are *all authors*. But that, as you have ſeen, is a vaſt, and truly *Baronian* untruth. They are but ſome: and the Card. nameth three, *Evagrius*, *Euſtathius*, and *Nicephorus Calliſtus*. I will yeeld more unto him if he pleaſe: let him have 10. or 20. to ſay what his fore-man doth: yet the law of God is forcible againſt them, as if they were but one: *Thou ſhalt not follow a multitude to doe evill*. And alas, what are theſe, either for number, or (which is more) for gravity and authority, to thoſe which we have before produced? To ſay nothing of that cloud of Hiſtorians: what are they to S. *Agatho*? to S. *Gregory*? to the Emperour *Conſtantinus Pogonatus*? to the Romane Synod? to the ſixt generall Councel? to all nations? to the whole world? to S. *Peter*? yea to the Holy Ghoſt himſelfe?

What an army of invincible, unreſiſtable Captaines, hath *Iuſtinian* to fight on his ſide, againſt two or three poore, petite, & contemptible witneſſes, which the Card. hath raked together, not to be named the ſame day with the former?

22. Will it pleaſe you further to take a view in particular of them? Truly of thoſe whom the Card. would not vouchſafe once to name, I will ſay nothing: if they were not worthy to be named, nor to have a whiſtle from the Cardinall, I thinke them unworthy to bee refuted alſo. This onely I ſay of them all, they were miſſe-led and deceived by thoſe whom the Card. mentioneth as his prime and principall witneſſes: and thoſe are *Evagrius*, *Euſtathius*, and *Nicephorus*. Now for the laſt of theſe, *Poſſevine* ſhewes him to be hereticall, [a] and in Hiſtoricall narrations, erroneous: and the Card. [b] himſelfe ſaith of him, *Fatuus judicandus eſt*, he is but a foole: and his reaſon is far worſe than his cenſure, becauſe he is not ſo virulent and ſpitefull in condemning the Emperour *Iuſtinian*, as the Card. could wiſh him, and as himſelfe is: beſides, what *Nicephorus* ſaith, is but borrowed from *Evagrius*, (*Poſſevine* [c] *calls him Aſſeclam*, a Page or Ape of *Evagrius*) and therefore the anſwer to *Evagrius* will be ſufficient for him alſo.

23. His middle witneſſe is *Euſtathius*, the writer of the life of *Eutychius*, which is ſet forth by *Surius*. He at large indeed deſcribeth this matter, both how *Iuſtinian* [d] *fell into this hereſie of the Aphthardokites, how hee writ an Edict for the ſame, and read it to Eutychius B. of Conſtantinople, urging him to approve it; how when he refuſed ſo to doe, the Emperor for this cauſe thruſt him from* [f] *his See, and ſent him into baniſhment; where he lived working abundance of miracles, for the ſpace* [g] *of 12. yeares, till Tiberius the Emperour reſtored him with great honour*. This is the ſumme of that narration of *Euſtathius*, in which the Card. much pleaſeth himſelfe, as if all that *Euſtathius* ſaith in this matter were an undoubted Oracle, ſeeing *Euſtathius* (as he often boaſteth [h]) *was preſent with Eutychius in all theſe occurrents, and an eye-witneſſe of them*.

24. But why did the Card. mention this worthy record out of *Surius*? could hee finde this writing of *Euſtathius* in no better Author than *Surius*? *Surius*, a man ſo proſtitute in faith, ſo delighted in lyes, and forgeries of this kinde, with which he hath ſtuffed his *Lives of the Saints*, that at the very firſt naming of *Surius*, I ſuſpected this *Euſtathius* to be but a forged Author, and a fabler: the rather becauſe neither *Photius*, nor *Sixtus Senenſis*, nor *Poſſevine*, (who all writ *Bibliothecas*,) nor *Tritemius*, mention any ſuch *Euſtathius* to have writ the life of *Eutychius*. But after I had peruſed and conſidered the writing it ſelfe, I did no longer ſuſpect, but I found (which now I do conſtantly affirm) that *Surian Euſtathius* to be ſo vile & abject a fabler, and ſo full of lyes, that none but ſuch as *Surius* and *Baronius*, men delighted in applauding forgeries and untruths, can give any credit at all to that *Surian Euſtathius*. By one or two examples take a conjecture of all the reſt.

25. That *Euſtathius* deſcribing the entrance of *Eutychius* to the See of Conſtantinople, tells [i] us that *after the fift generall Councell was ſummoned, Eutychius was ſent thither by the Biſhop of Amaſea, (who then was ſicke) to ſupplie his roome in the Councell. Mennas then Patri-*

[a] *Nicephorus Andronicum commendat quod S. Sanctã à ſolo Patre procedere per Synodum à ſe coactam promulgari curaverit. Poſſ. in verb. Nicephorus. Et, Habet tum in dogmatibus, tum in hiſtorica veritate quæ digna ſunt ut præcaveantur. Ibid.*

[b] *an. 563. nu. 8.*

[c] *In verbo Evagrius.*

[d] *Hic (Iuſtin.) cepit execrabilem opinionem probare, quæ Chriſti corpus incorruptum aſſerebat. Euſt. apud Sur. 6. April.*

[f] *Perſuaſerunt Imperatori, ut eum à ſede exturbaret, in eâq; alium conſtitueret, qui opinionibus ſuis conſentiret: quod et factum eſt. Ibid.*

[g] *Perduravit exilium Eutychii (ut idem author affirmat) ſpacio 12. annorum et amplius. Bar. an. 564. nu. 29.*

[h] *Hæc Euſtathius: Qui his omnibus præſens aderat. Bar. an. 564. nu. 20. præſens aſſexit. nu. 24. et alibi.*

[i] *Loc. citat.*

Patriarch of Conſtantinople, exhorted Eutychius not to depart from him, and ſhewing Eutychius to the Clergie, ſaid of him by way of propheſie (for that *Euſtathius* is full of miracles, propheſies, and viſions,) *unto them, This Monke ſhall be my ſucceſſor; and then ſent him to the Emperor. Some few dayes after this, Mennas dyed: and whereas many ſued for the Biſhopricke, the Emperour had a viſion, wherein S. Peter appeared unto him, ſhewing him Eutychius, and ſaying, Fac ut hic ſit Epiſcopus, ſee that this man be the Biſhop of Conſtantinople. The Emperour acquainted the Clergy with his viſion, and upon his oath teſtified it unto them; whereupon they all choſe Eutychius, and then he was conſecrated.* Thus the *Surian Euſtathius*. A narration ſo ſottiſh and ſo abſurd, that nothing can bee more ridiculous: and ſo untrue, that there are not ſo many words as lyes therein. The fift Councell was not ſummoned till the 26. yeare of *Iuſtinian*: and that before then, it could not be ſummoned, *Baronius* evidently ſheweth: For the ſummons to the Councell followed, as he ſaith, [k] *the reſtoring of Vigilius, and his reconcilement both to the Emperour, to Mennas, and to Theodorus of Cæſarea*: all which he [l] placeth in the 26. yeare of *Iuſtinian*. Now it is certaine by that teſtimony of the Popes Legates, which [m] before was handled, and was uttered before the ſixt generall Councell[n], and is acknowledged for true by *Baronius* [o], that *Mennas* died in the 21. yeare of *Iuſtinian*, that is, foure whole yeares at the leaſt before the ſummons of the Councell, or before *Eutychius* came to Conſtantinople, being ſent from the Biſhop of Amaſea. What a dull and doltiſh legend now is this of *Euſtathius*? to make *Eutychius* come and converſe with *Mennas*, to be brought by him to the Clergy, to be deſigned and prophetically foretold by *Mennas* to bee his ſucceſſor, when *Mennas* was dead foure whole yeares before he did any of theſe things? what a prophane fiction is it, to make the Emperour ſee a viſion, and Saint *Peter* to command him to take care that *Eutychius* ſhould be choſen, and the Emperour to avouch all this upon his oath to be true? whereas not one ſyllable thereof is true; or ſo much as poſſible; ſeeing *Eutychius* was actually placed in that See full foure years before this viſion, or before Saint *Peter* gave that ſtrait charge unto *Iuſtinian*. They who can beleeve theſe phantaſticall dotages of that *Surian Euſtathius*, (and *Baronius* [p] applauds this with the other narrations in that *Euſtathius*) little marvell, if upon his report they upbraid that which is every way as incredible, that *Iuſtinian* fell into that hereſie of the Phantaſtickes, and baniſhed *Eutychius* for not conſenting to the ſame.

26. Of no more truth is that which the ſame *Euſtathius* ſets downe for the continuance of the baniſhment of *Eutychius*, which was, *the ſpace of twelve* [m] *whole yeares, untill Tiberius was* [n] *aſſociated into the Empire by Iuſtinus, and in the ſame yeare when Iohn* [o] *the ſucceſſor to Eutychius dyed.* For *Theophanes*, as the Card. calls him, as other (though amiſſe) *Paulus Diaconus*, but the author of the *Miſcella. Hiſtoria*, expreſly witneſſeth [p] that *Iuſtinus* (who began his reigne two yeares after the baniſhment of *Eutychius*) was *crowned by Eutychius*. And *Zonaras* [q] for a certainty relates, *how that (before Tiberius was aſſociated) when Iuſtinus was ſicke, he called, beſides others, Eutychius unto him, and in their preſence nomi-*

k Sicq; animis junctus reſtitutoq; Romano Pontifice in priſtinam dignitatem indicta eſt oecumenica Synodus. *an.* 553. *nu.* 14.

l *an.* 552. *nu.* 19. & 20.

m *Sup. ca.* 16. *nu.* 18.

n *Act.* 3.

o *an.* 560. *nu.* 48

p *an.* 553. & *an.* 564. & *alibi*

m *Vt ex Euſtathio notat Baron. an.* 564. 29. & *an.* 578. *nu.* 3. 5. 6.

n *Ad Iuſtinum & Tiberium exclamant, ut fidei cuſtos (Eutychius) redderetur: qui id conceſſerunt. Verba Euſtath. Suriani. loc. cit.*

o Bar. *an.* 578. *nu.* 5.

p *Iuſtinus Imperator coronatus ab Eutychio Patriarch. lib.* 16 *Hiſt. Miſcel.*

q Zonar. *to.* 3. *in Iuſtin.*

nominated Tiberius to be his partner in the Empire: for Iohn, ſaith he, *being dead, Eutychius was reduced from baniſhment, & reſtored then to his See, and that Tiberius was crowned by the ſame Eutychius.* Which evidently demonſtrates the vanity of that whole Euſtathian Narration, wherein it is ſaid, that after the Empire of *Tiberius begun, the people came to them to entreat the reſtoring of Eutychius:* that the Emperors upon their ſupplication, *ſent poſt haſt to Amaſea to bring him home out of baniſhment:* that the *Angell* [r] *of God brought him miraculouſly thence:* that the people *flocked unto him in every place*: that they laid *their ſicke in the way, that at leaſt the ſhadow* of this ſecond *Peter* might touch them, *and according to their faith they were cured:* that he came like another Meſſias, *riding on the Colt of an Aſſe into Conſtantinople, the people cutting downe boughes, & ſpreading their garments for him, and ſo was with admirable joy received by the Emperors, and the whole City.* Not one word of all which is true, ſeeing *Eutychius* was long before the time of *Tiberius* reſtored from baniſhment, at the leaſt 11. or 12. yeares, even ever ſince the crowning of *Iuſtinus:* who reigned 12. [x] yeares alone, before he aſſumed *Tiberius* into the ſociety of the Empire. This will be further evident by thoſe words of *Nicephorus* Patriarch of Conſtantinople, on which *Baronius* relieth. *Eutychius* was recalled from baniſhment, as the Cardinall [t] teacheth, and that rightly, in the ſame yeare wherein *Iohannes Scholaſticus* (who was placed in his roome) died. *Now Iohn was Biſhop*, as *Nicephorus* [u] witneſſeth, *but two yeares and ſeven moneths.* Whereupon it certainly followeth, that *Eutychius* was recalled within three yeares after his baniſhment, that is, in the very firſt yeare of *Iuſtinus*, upon whom hee ſet the Crowne, at the ſolemnity of his firſt Coronation, as was ſhewed out of the *Hiſtoria Miſcella:* and this was full twelve yeares [x] before *Tiberius* was made Emperour. Which demonſtrates, not onely the untruth and manifold lyes of that *Surian Euſtathius*, but another handſome tricke of legerdemaine in *Anaſtaſius* and *Baronius*. For *Anaſtaſius* ſeeing belike that it was needfull (for ſaving the credit of ſome ſuch like fabler as this *Euſtathius* is) that *Iohn* ſhould bee Biſhop twelve yeares, he tranſlating [y] the Greeke *Nicephorus*, in ſtead of *two yeares ſeven moneths*, puts in *twelve* [z] *yeares and ſeven moneths*, and gives ſo many unto *Iohn* before *Eutychius* bee reſtored: and *Baronius* finding this account in the Anaſtaſian tranſlation, followeth it, [a] and ſaith, *Nicephorus aſcribes twelve yeares to Iohn:* whereas, not *Nicephorus*, nor his Greek edition (which hath onely two yeares and ſeven moneths) but the Anaſtaſian falſified and corrupted Latine tranſlation hath the other untrue and falſe accompt of twelve years and ſeven moneths. This, if nothing elſe, might be ſufficient to refute the whole fiction of that *Surian Euſtathius*, the untruths whereof *Baronius* could not defend, but by applauding the untrue and falſified writings of his fellow *Bibliothecarius*.

27. Perhaps you will demand, why then did *Iuſtinian* baniſh *Eutychius*, if not for refuſing to conſent to his opinion and hereſie of the Aphthardokites, as *Euſtathius* ſaith? which doubt ſeemes the greater, becauſe *Nicephorus* the Patriarch in his Chronology mentioneth the ſame cauſe, ſaying thus, *Eutychius was caſt out of his See by Iuſtinian, eo quod non reciperet edictum ipſius de corpore Chriſti experte omnis labefactionis*

r *Vere cognovimus Deum miſiſſe Angelum ſuum & eripuiſſe, &c.* Euſtat.

s *Iuſtinus per ſe ſolus ad annos 12. regnavit, & cum Tiberio annos 3.* Evagr. *Lib. 5. ca. 23.*

t *Hoc anno, defuncto Iohanne, revocatus eſt Eutychius exul.* an. 578. nu. 5.

u Ἐπὶ Μονάτ Ζ. *Niceph. in libro.*

x *Nam Iuſtinus ſolus totidem annos regnavit. ſup.*

y *Ab Anaſtaſio Bibliothecario hujus Chronologiæ interprete. &, Chronologia Nicephori converſa in Latinum per Anaſtaſium. Titulo Nicephori in Biblioth. S. Pat. to. 7.*

z *Iohannes an. 12. menſ. 7.*

a *Iohannes ſedit an 12. menſ. 7. ut habet Nicephori Chronicon. Bar. an. 564. nu. 29.*

factionis, becauſe *Eutychius* would not conſent to his Edict, that Chriſts body was incorruptible. See here againe I pray you, and deteſt for ever the vile and ſhameleſſe dealing of *Anaſtaſius*. *Nicephorus* ſaith not ſo; all that hee [c] ſaith, is, that *Eutychius was baniſhed becauſe hee would not receive or conſent unto the Edict of Iuſtinian*; but that which followeth, his Edict *de corpore Chriſti incorruptibili*, wherein is contained the hereſie ſlanderouſly objected to *Iuſtinian*, of that *Nicephorus* hath not one word in his Greeke text; that is wholy pacht to him in the Latine tranſlation by the falſe hand of *Anaſtaſius*, the Arch-corrupter of all writings in his time, as I have * before more at large declared: And yet ſo are they delighted with lyes, & corrupted writings, this Latine tranſlation, thus vilely falſified by *Anaſtaſius*, is ſet [d] in their *Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum*; which much better deſerves to bee called a Library of forged or corrupted Fathers, and Writers.

c Niceph. in edit. Græca.

* Sup. cap. 17.

d Tom. 7.

28. But for what other Edict, if not for this of the Aphthardokites, was *Eutychius* baniſhed? for that he was expelled from his See, there is no doubt, that being teſtified not onely by the Surian *Euſtathius*, *Zonaras*, *Glicas*, and others, but by *Victor* [e], who then lived, and was at *Conſtantinople* when theſe things fell out, to whom alone more credit herein is to bee given, than to five hundreth of the Surian records. Truly, whatſoever was the cauſe why he was baniſhed, certaine it is, that this hereſie of *Iuſtinian*, or any Edict made for it, was not the cauſe thereof: But there are two other matters, the one, or both of which may very well be thought to have incenſed *Iuſtinian* againſt him: The former was this; *Eutychius* pretended a Propheticall skill whereby hee could foreſhew who ſhould ſucceed in the Empire; and hee began to tamper and practice this Art about *ſome three yeares before Iuſtinian dyed*, as that *Euſtathius* delareth. *At that time* [f] *hee privately called Iuſtinus unto him, and told him that he ſhould ſucceed in the Empire after the death of Iuſtinian, for ſo* [g] (ſaid he) *God hath revealed unto mee*. The like good fortune hee foretold to *Tiberius*, *that* [h] *ere long he ſhould have the Empire alone*. Againe, two yeares before the death of *Tiberius*, hee propheſied of *Mauritius*, *that* [i] *hee, and none but hee ſhould have the Empire after Tiberius*; *idque juramento aſſeruit*, and hee confirmed this by an oath. Now this Art of Divination, and Mathematicall predictions, eſpecially when they prognoſticate of Kings their deaths, & ſucceſſours, was never allowable in any wiſe State, nor acceptable to any prudent Emperour. It betokened no good to *Cæſar* that they foretold [k] him of thoſe diſmall Ides of *March*. *Domitian* was foretold [l], not onely of the yeare, but of the day, and the very houre when hee ſhould dye; and when he had carefully looked to himſelfe on that day, enquiring [m] the houre, his owne men of purpoſe told him the ſixt, in ſtead of the fift: hee then thinking all danger to bee paſt, was by the Conſpiratours, (who kept a better watch of the time than he did) ſecurely murdered. What miſchiefe enſued upon that prediction to *Valence*, that one whoſe name did begin with *Theod.* ſhould ſucceed unto him, *Socrates* [n] declareth; Hee thereupon murdered moſt unjuſtly all whom he could finde to be called either *Theodori*, or *Theodoti*,

e *In Chron.*

f *Tribus circiter annis ante Imperium Juſtini. Guſt. apud Sur.*

g *Significavit mihi Deus te poſt avunculum tuum fore Imperatorem. Ibid.*

h *Nunc in parte reipublicæ gubernacula commiſit Deus; mox autem et finem concedet. Ibid.*

i *Verè (inquit) non eſt alius (qui ſuccedet) quam Mauritius. Ibid.*

k *Suet. in Iul. Cæſ. cap. 81.*

l *Suet. in Domit. cap. 13.*

m *Ibid. cap. 16.*

n *Lib. 4. cap. 19.*

doti, or *Theodoſij*, or *Theoduli*, or *Theodoſioli*, or beginning with thoſe letters. What hurt followed as wel in this kingdom, upon that propheſie G. ſhould ſucceed unto *Edward* the fourth; as in the next, when it was foretold the Earle of Athel, that hee ſhould bee crowned before hee dyed, who thereupon never ceaſed to rebell againſt his Soveraigne, till hee was crowned with an hot burning iron, our owne Chronicles doe declare. All kingdomes, all Stories are full of like examples. It was not without cauſe, that in the Code [p] both of *Theodoſius* and *Iuſtinian*, there are ſo many, and ſo ſevere lawes againſt this kinde of Mathematicall diviners, their Art [q] being called *damnabilis, & omnibus interdicta*, a damnable Art, forbidden to all; the puniſhment denounced againſt them, *being* [r] *baniſhment, yea, death; ſupplicio capitis* [r] *feriatur*, hee ſhall bee put to death who practiſeth the curioſitie of divining: Now *Eutychius* taking upō him this Art of divining, cōtrary to thoſe ſevere and Imperiall Edicts ratified by *Iuſtinian*, whether for this cauſe the Emperour, who by the law might have deprived him of his life, did not chuſe rather to deprive him onely of his See, and liberty, I leave to the judgement of others.

p *Tit. de Maleficis, Mathematicis, et his ſimilibus.*
q *Leg. 2. eod. tit. Cod. Iuſt.*
r *Non ſolum urbe Roma, ſed etiam omnibus civitatibus pelli decernimus. l. ult. Tit. de malef. Cod. Theod.*
ſ *Leg. 5. tit. de Malef. Cod. Iuſt. et leg. 4. Cod. Theod.*

29. The other cauſe was a moſt impious hereſie defended by *Eutychius*, whom they ſo much honour; which alone being duely conſidered, overthroweth that whole fabulous Legend of *Euſtathius*. *Eutychius*, when hee had long continued in the defence of the truth, did afterwards fall both by words and writing to maintaine the Hereſie of *Origen* and the Origeniſts, denying Chriſts body after the reſurrection to have beene palpable, that is in effect, to bee no true humane body; and the very like hee taught of the bodies of all other men after the reſurrection: This the Surian *Euſtathius* quite over-paſſeth in ſilence; for it was not fit that ſuch a Saint as *Eutychius*, ſo abundāt in miracles, propheſies, and viſions, ſhould be thought guilty of ſo foule and condemned an hereſie: But Pope *Gregory* doth ſo fully and certainly teſtifie [t] it, that no doubt can remaine thereof; hee tels us, *how himſelfe diſputed againſt Eutychius, defending this hereſie; how hee urged thoſe words of our Saviour, palpate & videte; how Eutychius anſwered thereunto, that Chriſts body was then indeed palpable to confirme the mindes of his Diſciples; but after they were once confirmed, all that was before palpable in Chriſts bodie, in ſubtilitatem eſt redactū*, was turned into an aërial and unpalpable ſubtilty; *How he further ſtrived to prove this by thoſe words of the Apoſtle, Fleſh & blood cannot inherit the kingdome of heavē; how then (ſaid hee) may this be beleeved, veraciter reſurgere carnem*, that true bodies did or ſhall riſe againe? *How he further inſiſted on thoſe words, That which thou ſoweſt is not the ſame body which it ſhall be: proving therby that which riſeth againe either not to be a body, or not a palpable, that is, no true humane body.* *Gregory* alſo tels us, that *Eutychius writ* [u] *a booke in defence of this hereſie, which both himſelfe read, and Tiberius the Emperour after diligent ponderation of the reaſons of Gregory againſt it, cauſed it publikely to bee burned, as hereticall*: adding, *that Eutychius continued in this hereſie almoſt till the very houre of his death.* Now although *Gregory* tels not when, or at what time *Eutychius* fel into this hereſie, yet it may wel be ſuppoſed, that as *Iuſtinian* honoured him ſo long as he perſiſted in the truth;

t *Greg. lib. 14. Moral. ca. 29. Eutychius ſcripſit quod corpus noſtrum in illa reſurrectionis gloria erit impalpabile.*

u *Libellum de Reſurrectione ſcripſit, oſtendēs quod caro vel impalpabilis, vel ipſa non erit.*

truth, ſo when once hee gave himſelfe to ſuch dotages of the Origeniſts, (which, as it ſeemes, he did about the latter end of *Iuſtinians* Empire, ſome three yeares before his death) then the Emperour, who till his end was conſtant in condemning the *Three Chapters*, as *Victor* ſheweth, (the condemning of which is, as before [t] we declared, the condemning of all the hereſies of *Origen*, and whatſoever contradicts the verity of Chriſts deity, or humanity) as it is moſt likely, exiled him for this heretical opinion: And this is much more probable, ſeeing *Iuſtinian* had purpoſely ſet forth, long before this, a moſt religious and orthodoxall Edict or Decree, particularly againſt *Origen*, and the Origeniſts, as *Liberatus* [u] ſheweth, and as the Edict it ſelfe, which is extant [x], doth manifeſt, condemning them in particular [y], *for denying the verity of Chriſts, and other humane bodies after the reſurrection.* Seeing then *Nicephorus* the Patriarch ſaith, that *Eutychius* was baniſhed for not conſenting to the Emperours Edict, and *Eutychius* by his defending of that hereſie of the Origeniſts, directly oppugned that his Edict; moſt like it is, that (beſides his Mathematicall Art, whereby hee was liable both to death and baniſhment, by the Emperours lawes) this Edict of *Iuſtinian* againſt *Origen*, ſhould bee that which *Nicephorus* the Patriarch meant, and for which *Eutychius* was, and that moſt juſtly, exiled. So not *Iuſtinian*, but *Eutychius*, was the heretike; nor was it any hereticall Edict of *Iuſtinian*, (as the Surian *Euſtathius*, and after him *Baronius* affirmeth) to which *Eutychius* a Catholike oppoſed himſelfe; but an orthodoxall and Catholike Edict of *Iuſtinian*, which *Eutychius*, then an heretike, and Origeniſt, oppugned, for not conſenting whereunto hee was baniſhed. Thus not onely the Emperour is clearly acquitted of that phantaſticall hereſie, whereof the Surian *Euſtathius*, and *Baronius* doe accuſe him; but *Eutychius* himſelfe, whom they honour for a Saint, a Prophet, and a Demi-god, is found guilty of that ſelfe-ſame crime, and of that very hereſie of denying the truth of Chriſts body, which they unjuſtly and ſlanderouſly impute to *Iuſtinian*. And this I thinke is abundant to ſatisfie the Cardinals ſecond witneſſe, namely that fabulous and legendary Surian *Euſtathius*.

[t] *Hoc cap. nu. 13*

[u] *Cap. 23.*
[x] *Apud Bar. an. 538. nu. 33. & Bin. tom. 2. pa. 482.*
[y] (*Quamobrem hoc quoque viſa dignum eſt*) *et Anath. 5.*

30. All the Cardinals hope, and the whole waight of his accuſation relyes now on *Evagrius*. He, I confeſſe, ſaith well neere as much as *Baronius*, againſt *Iuſtinian, accuſing him of avarice, injuſtice, and hereſie*. But the credit of *Evagrius* is not ſuch, as to countenance ſuch calumnies. *Evagrius*, in ſome matters wherein hee followeth Authors of better note, is not be contemned, but in very many hee is too credulous, fabulous, and utterly to bee rejected. What credit can you give unto this Narration [a] of the Monke *Barſanuphius*, whom he reports to have lived *in his Cell, wherein he had mewed up himſelfe; and for the ſpace of fifty yeares and more, neither to have beene ſeene by any, neque quidquam alimenti cepiſſe*, nor to have received any nouriſhment, or food? What a worthy S. doth he [b] deſcribe *Simeon Môros*, that is S. Foole, to have been? How doth he commend [c] *Syneſius*, whom they perſwaded to bee baptized, and undertake the function of a Prieſt, though hee did not conſent to the doctrine of the reſurrection, *neque ita cenſere vellet*, neither would beleeve that it was poſſible? The like might

[a] *Evag. lib. 4. ca. 32.*
[b] *Lib. eod. ca. 33*
[c] *Lib. 1. ca. 15.*

might bee noted, touching the blood of *Euphemia* [d], and divers other Narrations. *Evagrius* is full of ſuch like fables; but omitting the reſt, I will propoſe onely two, which will demonſtrate him to have beene either extremely negligent in the ſearch, or very malicious in perverting the truth.

d *Lib.2.ca.3.*

31. The former concernes *Neſtorius* Biſhop of Conſtantinople, and his ſucceſſor *Maximianus*. *Evagrius* ſaith [e], that *Maximianus tooke the Biſhopricke after the death of Neſtorius:* An untruth ſo palpable, that none can thinke *Evagrius* to have bin ignorant of thoſe manifold and undoubted records which teſtifie the contrary: For it appeares by the writings of *Neſtorius*, ſet downe alſo in *Evagrius* [f] himſelfe, that after his depoſition, *hee ſtayed at Epheſus, and about Antioch, for the ſpace of foure yeares, and then was exiled to Oaſis.* Now *Maximianus* was placed in the See of Conſtantinople, *that very ſame yeare,* wherein the Epheſine Councell was held, and *Neſtorius* depoſed *ſome three or foure* [g] *months after the ſame depoſition*, as *Socrates* and *Liberatus* declare. The next year after the Councel, the union was made between *Iohn* & *Cyrill*; *Iohn* & the reſt with him profeſſing expreſly in their letters [h] of union, *that they acknowledge & receive Maximianus for Biſhop of Conſtatinople:* A demonſtration, that *Maximianus* was Biſhop of Conſtantinople, three whole yeares at leaſt before the death of *Neſtorius*: Nay, which argueth *Evagrius* to have doated in hiſtoricall relations, *Maximianus* was dead, and *Proclus* placed in his See long before the baniſhment of *Neſtorius* to *Oaſis*, much more, before his death; for *Maximianus* was Biſhop but two yeares and five months, and hee dyed before the Ides of *Aprill*, when *Ariobindus* and *Aſper* were Conſuls; and before he was buried, was *Proclus* placed in the See the ſame yeare, as *Socrates* witneſſeth. Now *Neſtorius* lived foure yeares at *Epheſus*, and about *Antioch*, after his depoſition, and ſome while alſo in baniſhment at *Oaſis*, as *Evagrius* himſelfe affirmeth: So that by *Evagrius* Narration *Maximianus* was made Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* two yeares after his death; and both *Proclus* and *Maximianus* were Biſhops at once of that See. So well doth *Evagrius* relate matters of fact, and ſuch credit is to be given unto him.

e *Lib.1.ca.8.*

f *Narrat ipſe Neſtorius ſe in eo loco quadriennij ſpacio commoratum, & poſtea relegatum ad Oaſim. Lib.1 cap.7.*

g *Soc.lib. 7. ca. 34. & Liber. Brev.ca.7.*

h *Epiſt. Johannis, et Orientalium Cyrillo, to.5 Act.Epheſ.ca.5 & ca.17.*

32. The other concernes the fable touching the Epiſtle and Image of Chriſt ſent to *Abgarus*, which *Evagrius* [k] paints out at large, and in moſt lively colours: *He commends the Epiſtle as a true writing of Chriſt, and celebrated by the Ancients;* Hee cals the Image ſent to *Abgarus*, *a moſt holy Image*; He tels you, *it was not made by the hand of man, but framed immediately by God*; that *Chriſt himſelfe ſent it to Abgarus, when he was deſirous to ſee him*; that by reaſon of this Image and writing kept at Edeſſa, it was famouſly reported and beleeved by all the faithfull, *that the City of Edeſſa ſhould never be conquered*: (that Image made it unconquerable) Hee addes, *the event did confirme that prædiction to bee true*. Hee ſaith, that when *Coſroes* beſieged the City, and had almoſt taken it, then the *Edeſſanes brought forth that divine Image, and laid it in a ditch, to keepe away the Engines wherewith* Coſroes *intended to deſtroy the City, and that by this meanes* Coſroes *was faine to returne home, not onely without the victory, but with great ignominie*: and for confirmation of this,

k *Lib.4.ca.26.*

i *Lib.7.ca.39.*

this, hee ſaith, *Procopius hath related this concerning Edeſſa, and the Epiſtle of Chriſt*, This is the Narration of *Evagrius*, which for the worthineſſe thereof is approved and applauded by their ſecond Nicene [n] Synod: to which Synod you need not doubt but *Baronius* ſubſcribeth. [n] Act. 5. pa. 354

33. By this now judge of the fidelity, & truth, not only of *Evagrius*, but of their Nicene Councell and *Baronius*; for in this whole narration there is not a ſillable of truth, it is nothing but a fardle, or dunghill of lyes. Firſt, whereas *Evagrius* fathereth this on *Procopius*, that is utterly untrue: In *Procopius* there is not any mention either of *Abgarus* or of Chriſts Epiſtle, or of that Image made without hands, or of any prædiction touching the unconquerable City of Edeſſa, or that the Edeſſanes brought forth any ſuch Image in the time of the Siege, or that they laid it in the ditch, or that by the meanes of it *Coſroes* was vanquiſhed; all theſe are the fictions of *Evagrius*, and thoſe alſo quite contrary to the true relation of *Procopius*; for hee [o] *aſcribes the repulſing of* Coſroes *from the City, to the noble military skill and ſtratagem of the Romane Captaines*; by reaſon whereof when *Coſroes* perceived his attempt to bee in vaine, hee made peace with the Romanes; but yet ſo, that the Romanes *yeelded to pay unto him*, quinquaginta millia aureorum, *thoſe fifty thouſand pieces of Gold, which hee at the beginning of the ſiege demanded, and for which he offered to deſiſt from warre.* [o] Proc. lib. 2. de bel. Perſ.

34. Againe, whereas *Evagrius*, to juſtifie that lying prediction, as divine and propheticall, ſuch as the faithfull then beleeved as a propheſie of God, ſaith, that the Event did prove it to bee true; in that, *Evagrius* proves himſelfe to bee ſo extremely falſe, that almoſt nothing in him may be credited, but certainly not for his authority: for in the firſt yeare of *Heraclius*, (at which time it is not unlike but *Evagrius* lived, for he writ his hiſtory but ſome ſixteene yeares before) the event plainely demonſtrated the contrary, and this to bee no divine propheſie, but a lying fiction; *Then the Perſians came againſt Syria*, ſaith the Author * of the *miſcella: hiſtoria, & ceperunt Edeſſam*; and they won and took Capeſſa and Edeſſa, and proceeded as farre as Antioch; yea, *Coſroes* then ſo prevailed againſt Chriſtians, that *Heraclius* [p] was faine to *ſend many Legacies to intreate peace, offering to pay what* [q] *tribute hee would impoſe; but the Perſian diſdainefully anſwered, Non parcam vobis donec Crucifixum abnegetis & adoretis Solem*; I will not ſpare you, till you renounce the profeſſion of Chriſt, and with us adore the Sunne. How did their *Palladium*, that divine Image, now defend them? or how could that bee a divine prædiction, which for ſuch *Evagrius* commends, and ſaith, *the event proved it to bee true*, when the event within leſſe than twenty yeares after demonſtrated it to bee a lye? * Lib. 18. an. 1. Heracl. [p] Ibid. an. 3. & an. 4. & an. 8. [q] Rogavit ut deſiſteret tributa, et pacta acciperet. Ibid. [r] Ibid. an. 8. & Zonar. to. 3. in Heracl.

35. But that which is the principall fault in this narration, is, that *Evagrius approves, as true and certain, that Epiſt. of Chriſt ſent to Abgarus*, which is indeed the ground of the whole fable. Now that Epiſtle to be a reprobated and rejected writing, & condemned by the Church, is ſo cleare, that their owne Writers proclame the ſame. Biſhop *Canus* [s], among other bookes which the Church (as hee ſaith) rejecteth, recites *Epiſtolam Ieſu ad Abgarum*, and *Hiſtoriam* Euſebij; theſe two [s] Loc. Theol. lib. 11. c. 6. Rejicitur

by

by name, the Church (ſaith he) rejecteth; & becauſe ſome ignorāt perſons thought that touching *Euſebius* Hiſtory not to be the words of *Gelaſius*, and the Councell, *Canus* refuting thoſe, gives this, as the reaſon why *Euſebius* is rejected, *becauſe in it is ſet downe the Epiſtle of Ieſus to Abgarus, quam Gelaſius explodit*, which Epiſtle *Gelaſius* doth hiſſe out of the Church. This Epiſtle of *Ieſus* to *Abgarus*, ſaith *Sixtus Senenſis*, Pope *Gelaſius inter ſcripturas Apochryphas rejicit*, doth reject among other Apocryphall writings *Coſter* their Ieſuit ſaith, Euſebius *relates how* Chriſt *ſent a letter to* Abgarus, *but that letter was never, pro ejuſmodi accepta ab Eccleſia, eſteemed for ſuch, (that is, not for Chriſts) by the Church.* But the words of *Gelaſius*, & the whole Roman Councel with him, are of all moſt remarkeable: They having expreſſed and named a long Catalogue of ſuch fabulous writings, and particularly this *Epiſtle of Chriſt to Abgarus*, (which *Evagrius* approveth) ſet downe this cenſure of them all; *Theſe, and all like unto theſe, wee confeſſe to bee not onely refuſed, but alſo* eliminata, *caſt out of the Church by the whole Romane Catholike and Apoſtolike Church, atque cum ſuis authoribus, authorumque ſequacibus, ſub anathematis indiſſolubili vinculo in æternum confitemur eſſe damnata*, and wee confeſſe as well theſe writings, as the Authors and the followers alſo of them to bee eternally condemned under the indiſſoluble bond of an *Anathema*. So *Gelaſius* and the whole Romane Councell: whereby it is evident, that not onely this Epiſtle, and the Author of it, but that *the followers of the Author*, the *approvers of that Epiſtle*, that is, *Evagrius*, and the whole ſecond Nicene Synod, and *Baronius* himſelfe, that theſe alſo are anathematized, condemned and accurſed by the judgement of the whole *Romane Catholike Church*, and that alſo *by an indiſſoluble bond of an Anathema*. Such an untrue and fabulous, yea miſerable aud accurſed witneſſe hath the Cardinall choſen of *Evagrius*, by the warrant and authority of whom hee might inſult upon, and revile the Emperour: but now the Cardinall hath farre more neede to excuſe *Evagrius* from lies, than by his lying reports to accuſe others; and now hee may clearly ſee that cenſure of condemnation, which hee, with *Evagrius*, moſt raſhly and unjuſtly objecteth to the Emperour, to fall on *Evagrius*, their ſecond Nicene Fathers, and the Cardinals owne pate; ſince they all, by approving that Narration touching *Abgarus*; or being *ſequaces* of the Author thereof, are pronounced to bee eternally condemned by *the judgement of the whole Romane Catholike Apoſtolicall Church*: It is fit ſuch a cenſure ſhould ever paſſe on them, who open their mouthes in reviling manner againſt religious and holy Emperours, the anointed of the Lord.

t *Bibl. ſanc. li. 2.*

u *Enchir. Tit. de ſac. Scrip. Palam.*

x *Concil. Rom. 1 ſub Gelaſ.*

36. You doe now evidently ſee, not onely *Iuſtinian* to bee cleared of thoſe odious and indigne imputations of hereſie, tyranny, perſecution, and other crimes, which the Cardinall in ſuch ſpitefull manner upbraideth unto him, but all thoſe witneſſes whom hee hath nominated, and produced in this cauſe, to be ſo light, and of ſo little account, that they are utterly unworthy to bee put in the skales or counterpoized with thoſe honourable and innumerable witneſſes, which, (as wee have ſhewed) doe with a loud and conſenting voyce proclame, that

that Faith, Piety, Prudence, Iuſtice, Clemencie, Bounty, and all other Heroicall and Princely vertues have ſhined in *Iuſtinian*, which have beautified any of the moſt renowned and religious Emperors that the Church hath had. Let us now proceed to thoſe effects which *Baronius* obſerveth to have enſued upon the hereſie of *Iuſtinian*, and the perſecution raiſed by his maintaining of the ſame. Now indeed this whole paſſage might juſtly be omitted, for, *ſublata cauſa tollitur effectus*; ſeeing *Iuſtinian* held no ſuch hereſie as hee is ſlandered withall, there neither was, nor could there bee any effects or conſequents of a cauſe not exiſtent: Yet will I not ſo ſleightly reject the Cardinals calumnie in this point, but fully examine, firſt the publike, and then the private miſchiefes, which hee, without all truth hath fancied, and objected againſt the Emperour.

37. The publike was *partly the ſubverſion and overthrow of the faith*, and partly the *decay of the Empire in the time, and under the government of Iuſtinian. Diſertus eſſe poſſet*; Hee that would in an elaborate ſpeech refute this calumnie of *Baronius*, might have an ample ſcope to diſplay all his Art and skill in this ſo large an argument: My purpoſe is onely to point at the ſeverall heads, and not expatiate at this time. Truly, the Cardinall could hardly have deviſed any calumny more eaſie to be refuted, or more evidently witneſſing his malicious and wilfull oppugning of the truth. I will not inſiſt on thoſe private teſtimonies: of *Procopius*, [a] *Iuſtinian ſeemeth to have beene advanced by God to that Imperiall dignitie, ut totum Imperium repararet*, that he might repaire and beautifie the whole Empire: Of *Otho* [b], *Iuſtinian being a moſt valiant and moſt Chriſtiã Prince, Imperiũ quaſi mortuũ reſuſcitavit*, did raiſe the Empire as it were from death to life, *and exceedingly repaired the Commonwealth being decayed*: Of *Gotofrid* [c], *The whole glory of God was repaired by his vertue, and the Church rejoyced in the ſtable peace which under him it injoyed*: Of *Wernerus* [d], *Hee was in all things moſt excellent, and by his juſt lawes, and wiſedome he governed the world; by his impiety he glorified God*: Of *Aimonius* [e], *He was a Catholike, a pious, a juſt Emperour, therefore all things proſpered under his hands*. I oppoſe to that Baronian calumny, *the judgment of Pope Agatho, and of the Romane Councell with him*, wherin this is expreſly witneſſed, [f] *His integritie in faith did much pleaſe God, & exalt the Chriſtian Common-wealth*: and againe [g], *His vertue and pietie, omnia in meliorem ordinem reſtauravit*, reſtored all things into a better ſtate and condition: All, both Church and Common-wealth, both the Civill and Eccleſiaſticall ſtate: he reſtored all. I oppoſe the ſixt generall Councell, that is, the judgement of the whole Church, in wch the *ſuggeſtions of Agatho*, evẽ in that point, according to the Cardinals doctrine [h], *are approved as uttered by S. Peter, yea, by the holy Ghoſt himſelf*. Theſe pregnant and irrefragable teſtimonies of ſo many, ſo holy, and divine witneſſes, are able, I ſay not to confute, but utterly to confound & overwhelme *Baronius* wth his deformed & decrepit calumnie.

a *Lib.3.de adiſ. Juſtin.pa.* 431.

b *Lib.5.ca.4.*

c *In Chron. part. 16.in Juſtinian.*

d *An.*504.

e *De geſt. Fr. lib. 2.ca.8.*

f *In Epiſt. Agat. Act.4.Conc.6. pa.18.a.*

g *Ibid. in Epiſt. Synod. pa.22.*

h *Vid. ſup. hoc cap. nu.18.*

38. If any further pleaſe to deſcend to particulars, wherher hee caſt his eyes on the Church or Common-wealth, he ſhal ſee every Region, every Province, almoſt every City & Towne proclaiming the honour of *Iuſtinian*: Beſides, his *happy appeaſing of thoſe manifold broyles,*

and ſuppreſsing ſundry hereſies which infeſted the Church in his dayes, among which this concerning the *Three Chapters* was the chiefe: How infinite monuments did he leave of his piety and zeale to Gods glory & the good of his Church, in building new, in repairing decaied Churches, reducing both to a moſt magnificēt beauty? The Church of *Chriſt* called *Sophia*, built by him at Conſtantinople, was the mirrour of all Ages: Of it *Procopius*, an eye-witneſſe, teſtifieth, [i] *that the magnificence thereof amazed thoſe who ſaw it, but was incredible to thoſe that ſaw it not: the* [k] *height of it mounted up into the heaven, the ſplendor of it was ſuch, as if it received not* [l] *light from the Sun, but had it in it ſelfe; the roofe deckt with Gold, the pavement beſet* [m] *with Pearle; the ſilver of the Quire onely contained foure* * *Myriads, that is, forty thouſand pounds*; in ſo much that it is ſaid [n], *to have excelled the Temple of Salomon.* Further, in the honour of the bleſſed Virgin hee builded every where ſo many houſes, ſo ſtately and ſumptuous throughout the Roman Empire, *that if you ſhould contemplate but onely one of them, you would thinke* (ſaith *Procopius* [o]) *his whole raigne to have beene imployed in building that alone*. At *Conſtantinople* he builded three [p], one in *Blacernis*, another in *Pege*, a third in *Hierio*: beſides others builded in honour of *Anna*, of *Zoa*, of *Michael*, of *Peter* and *Paul*, of *Sergius* and *Baccus*, *utrumque fulgore lapillorum Solem vincit*, either of which, by the brightneſſe of precious ſtones, excelled the Sunne; of *Andrew*, *Luke* and *Tymothy*, of *Acatius*, of *Mocius*, of *Thirſis*, of *Theodorus*, of *Tecla*, of *Theodota*: *Hæc omnia ex fundamentis erexit*, All theſe he raiſed from the very ground and foundation: *and that at Conſtantinople; the beauty and dignity of which cannot by words bee expreſſed, by viewing be perluſtrated.* Nor did he this to one onely Citie; he builded like magnificent Churches, at *Antioch* [q], at *Sebaſtia*, at *Nicopolis*, at *Theodoſia*, at *Tzani*, at *Iuſtinianea* [r], where hee was borne, at *Epheſus* [ſ], at *Helena*, at *Nice*, at *Pythia*, at *Ieruſalem*, ſo magnificent, *ut nullum aliud æquipare poſsit*, that none other may compare with it; at *Iericho*, at mount *Gerazim*, at mount *Sinai*, at *Theopolis*, at *Ægila* [t], *where they ſacrificed to* Iupiter Hammon *and* Alexander *the great, even to that time*; at *Boreion*, at *Tripolis*, at *Carthage*, at the *Gades*, or *Hercules* pillers, which was the uttermoſt border of the known world in thoſe dayes: So that one may truly ſay of him, *Imperium Oceano, famam qui terminat aſtris*; his piety and zeale reacheth as farre as the earth, his honour as high as the heaven. And yet have I ſaid nothing at all of the *Monaſteries*, *Zenodochies*, *Noſodochies*, and other like *Hoſpitals*, which, out of his moſt pious affection to God and Gods Church, he not onely erected, but inriched *with large patrimonies and poſſeſsions*, which for number are as I ſuppoſe equall, for expences greater, than the former: all the particulars whereof I referre to be read in *Procopius*, who conſidering, beſide other matters, al theſe magnificent and ſumptuous buildings, did truly ſay of *Iuſtiniā* [u], *Nulla honorandi Dei ſatietas eum cepit*, he was never wearied, never ſatiate with honouring of God.

40. After the Church, wil it pleaſe you to take a view of the civil ſtate & Empire. No mans tongue or pen can equall or come neare his acts, and moſt deſerved praiſe. The whole Empire at the beginning of his reigne was in a maner ſpoyled & defaced. In the Eaſt, the Perſiās held a great

[i] *Proc. lib. 1. de ædif. Iuſtin. pa. 423.*
[k] *Aſſurgit in altitudinem cæli. Ibid.*
[l] *Diceres locum illum non externo ſole illuminari. Ibid.*
[m] *Pavimentum ex diverſi coloris unionibus perfectum. Glic. Annal. part. 4.*
* *Myriadas 4. cælati argenti habuiſſe ſertur. Proc. loc. cit.*
[n] *Hoc ædificio Solomonem eſſe ſuperatum. Glic. loc. cit.*
[o] *Lib. 1.*
[p] *Ibid.*
[q] *Pro. lib. 2.*
[r] *Lib. 4.*
[ſ] *Lib. 5.*
[t] *Lib. 6. pa. 453.*
[u] *Lib. 1. pa. 424*

a great part of Aſia; in the South, the Vandals poſſeſſed Africk; in the Weſt, the Goths uſurped Italy, and Rome it ſelfe; in the North, the Franks, Almanes, and other people withdrew Germany, France, and other Northerne Countries. *Iuſtinian*, finding the Empire thus torne aſunder on every ſide, freed it from all theſe enemies; and having moſt happily ſubdued, and glorioufly triumphed over them all, by his victorious conqueſts, hee purchaſed thoſe manifold titles, which are ſo many Trophees, Creſts, and Enſignes of his immortall honour, to bee ſurnamed *Iuſtinian the Great* [h], *happy* [i], *renowned, victorious, and Triumphant Auguſtus, Alamanicus, Gothicus, Francicus, Germanicus, Anticus, Alanicus, Vandalicus, Africanus:* So at once he purchaſed both honor to himſelfe, and peace and tranquillity to the Empire. Neither did he this only by his conqueſts, and recovery of thoſe great Nations, which the Empire had loſt; but further alſo by his prudence hee ſo fortified them, being recovered, by building and repairing their ruinated Cities, by erecting Caſtles, Forts, and ſtrong places of munition; by furniſhing them all with the commodities of waters, of wals, of promontories, of havens, of bridges, of baths, of goodly buildings, and other matters, ſerving either for the neceſſity or pleaſure of habitation, that the whole Empire by his wiſedome and government was made, as it were, one great and ſtrong City, both commodious and delightful to his owne ſubjects, and inexpugnable to his enemies: So in Media hee fortified Doras [k]; in Perſia, Siſauranon; in Meſopotamia, Baros; in Syria, Edeſſa, and Callinicum; in Commagine, Zenobia; in Armenia, Martyropolis [l]; in the other Armenia, Theodoſiopolis; in Tzani, Burgunocie; *Totam* [m] *Europã inacceſſam reddidit*; he made the whole Country of Europe unconquerable: Taureſium, where he was borne, hee exceedingly fortified, and beautified, and called it Iuſtinianea; the like hee did to Vlpiana, and called it Iuſtinianea *ſecunda*: neare to it he builded Iuſtinopolis; he repaired all Epyrus, Ætolia, Acarnania; *Vniverſam Græciam*, he fortified al Greece: the like hee did in Theſſalia, and Euboea, *Quam penitus inexpugnabilem & invictã reddidit*, which hee made inexpugnable: The like hee did in Thrace, in Miſia, and in Scythia alſo; in Libya [n], in Numidia, and at the very Gades. Time would faile me to recount the one halfe of his famous buildings in this kinde, they may bee read in *Procopius*; who thus concludeth, *Nulli* [a] *dubium eſt*, no man may doubt, *but that Iuſtinian fortified the Romane State with munitions, and ſtrong holds, from the Eaſt unto the Weſt, and to the very utmoſt borders of the Empire:* Who further in admiration of theſe workes of *Iuſtinian* not onely cals [b] him, *Orbis reparatorem*, the repairer of the whole world, but adds this memorable ſaying of him, *That there hath* [c] *not beene any in all ages, nor among all men, more provident, more careful for the publike good, than Iuſtinian, unto whom nothing was difficult, no not to bridle and confine the Seas, to level the Mountaines, and overcome thoſe things which ſeeme impoſſible.*

h *Iuſtiniani magni. Epiſt. Agath. et Synod. Rom. Act. 4. Conc. 6.*

i *In præf. ad Inſtitut. Juſtin.*

k *Inexpugnabiles hoſtibus effecit. Proc. lib. 2. de ædif. Iuſt.*

l *Ibid. lib. 3.*

m *Lib. 4.*

n *Lib. 6.*

a *Lib. 6. pa. 456.*

b *Lib. 4. pa. 439.*

c *Quapropter nemo contenderit, per omnem ætatem fuiſſe quempiam ex omnibus hominibus Iuſtiniano magis providum, & accuratiorem. Lib. 4. pa. 440.*

40. Even *Evagrius* himſelfe, whoſe ſpite and ſpleene was (as I conjecture by ſome welwiller of the *Three Chapters*, of which there were divers in the time of *Gregory*, when *Evagrius* writ) incenſed againſt *Iuſtinian*, could not chuſe but teſtifie this. [d] *It is reported of him, that he*

d *Evagr. lib. 4. ca. 18.*

hee reſtored anew, an hundreth and fifty Cities, which were either wholly overthrowne, or exceedingly decayed, and that he beautified them with ſuch & ſo great ornaments, with houſes both private and publike, with goodly walles, with faire and ſumptuous buildings, and Churches, ut nihil poſsit eſſe magnificentius, that nothing can bee more magnificent: So hee. And yet all theſe Buildings, Munitions, Caſtles and Forts, are not comparable to thoſe moſt wholeſome *Imperiall Lawes*, whereby hee moſt wiſely ordered & governed the whole Empire: that alone was a work of ſo great value & excellency, that I may truly ſay, that all his victories & victorious triumphs over the Perſians, the Gothes, the Vandals, and other nations, never gained ſo much honour unto him, as did that his more than *Herculean* labour in compoſing and digeſting the lawes, to the unſpeakeable benefit of the whole Chriſtian world: for as by his victories and buildings, he reſtored but the materiall Cities and wals thereof, ſo by this he repaired the men themſelves, and their mindes, reducing them from rude and barbarous behaviour to civility and order, ſetting them in ſuch a conſtant forme of civill government, as all Chriſtian Kingdomes ſince have not onely with admiration extolled, but with moſt happy ſucceſſe embraced and followed.

41. Iudge now, I pray you, uprightly of the Cardinals dealing, who declames againſt this Emperor, and reviles him in moſt odious terms, as an *unjuſt, avaricious, ſacrilegious, tyrannicall perſon*, calling him *a dolt, a foole, a mad-man, an heretike, an Antichriſt, a perſecutor of the faith, negligent of the civill, diſturber of the Eccleſiaſticall State, under whom the Empire and Common-wealth decayed, and declined, the Church was oppreſſed, and the faith overthrowne*: Whereas it doth now appeare by evidences of all ſorts, that hee was a Prince, not onely Catholike, pious, prudent, magnanimous, juſt, munificent, and moſt vigilant for the good, both of the Church and Common-wealth, but ſo adorned with the concurrence of all thoſe heroicall vertues, which have beene ſingle in other men of great fame, as if in him we ſhould ſee the compleate Idea of a worthy Emperour; hee being for politicall prudence, *Solon*; for valour and victorious conqueſts, *Alexander*; for magnificence, *Auguſtus*; for his piety, conſtant love and zeale to the faith, *Conſtantine*, *Theodoſius* or *Martian*; for multiplicity of labours, undertaken for the good of the whole Empire, more indefatigable than *Hercules*; and for ſupporting the whole fabricke of the Church and Chriſtian faith, a very *Atlas*; *Cælum qui vertice fulcit*.

42. There onely remaineth now the other effect, which is private: which as it is the laſt, ſo is it the heavieſt puniſhment that *Baronius* could wiſh unto *Iuſtinian*, and that is, *his adjudging him to the pit and torments of hell*. Did he not feare the Apoſtles reproofe, either againſt raſh and temerarious judgers, *Who [f] art thou that judgeſt another mans ſervant?* or againſt uncharitable cenſures, *Charity thinketh not evill [g], it rejoyceth not in iniquity, but rejoyceth in the truth*. why did not the Cardinall harken rather to the judgement of the Church of *Conſtantinople? Wherein the memory [h] of Iuſtinian was yearely celebrated, and that with great pompe and ſolemnity in the Church of* Sophia, *in the time of divine ſervice, all the people being aſſebled*. The like celebrity [i] of his *memory*

[f] *Rom.* 14. 4.
[g] 1 *Cor.* 13. 5.
[h] *In ipſo Dei Verbi Sapientiæ templo quotannis magnificè memoriam ejus celebrari, populi univerſi concione ad rem divinam conſtla. Nicep. lib.* 17. *ca.* 31.
[i] *Ibid.*

was

was obſerved at Epheſus in the Church of Saint Iohn, *which he had builded:* Or if the authority of theſe particular Churches could not ſway the Cardinall, ſeemed it a ſmall matter unto him to contemne the conſenting judgement of Pope *Agatho*, and his Romane Councell, which ranke him among the glorious and bleſſed Saints in heaven, with Saint *Conſtantine*, *Theodoſius*, and *Martian*? yea, of the whole ſixt generall Councell, *wherein his memory is ſo often called, holy, bleſſed, divine, happy, and the like?* & if his memory, then much more himſelfe is happy and bleſſed; for to the juſt onely doth that honor belong; *The* [k] *memoriall of the juſt ſhall be bleſſed, but the name of the wicked ſhall rot.* To which purpoſe that is ſpecially to be obſerved which *Nicephorus* addeth in plaine termes of the ſixt generall Councell, *Iuſtinianum* [l] *beata quiete dignatur*, It placeth *Iuſtinian* in bleſſed reſt and peace: and againe, *Semper eum qui in Sanctis eſt Iuſtinianum dicunt*, That general Councell ever calleth *Iuſtinian* one who is a Saint, and among the Saints. Adde to all theſe, that ſeeing, by the Cardinals confeſſion, the Epiſtles of *Agatho*, *In omnibus* (and therefore even in that which he ſaith of this holy Emperour, *That hee is a bleſſed Saint, venerable in all Nations*) are to be imbraced as divine Oracles; it may bee truly concluded, that *Iuſtinian*, not onely by the teſtimonies of mortall men, and of all nations, but even by the voyce of God himſelfe is bleſſed, and hath ever ſince his death, and doth now reſt, and raigne with God. When by the unpartiall judgement of S. *Agatho*, of the Romane Synod, of the whole ſixt generall Councell, of all Nations, yea, of God himſelfe, *Iuſtinian* is proclamed to be a venerable Saint, now reſting & raigning with God in heaven: who is *Baronius*, a man of yeſterday, that after a thouſand years poſſeſſion of that heavenly reſt, he ſhould unſaint him, dethrone him, and thruſt him downe to the loweſt pit and moſt hideous torments of hell? I'ſt not enough for that *Hildebrandicall* generation to deveſt Kings & Emperors of their earthly diadems, unleſs in the pride of their hearts climbing up into heaven, they thruſt them out thence alſo, & deprive them of their crowns of immortality, & eternal glory?

[k] Pro.10.7.

[l] Loc.citat.

43. And yet were there neither Hiſtorian nor Pope, nor Provinciall, nor Generall Councell, to teſtifie this felicity of *Iuſtinian* unto us; that very text, out of which, being maimed, the Cardinall ſucked poyſon, and collected *His* death & damnation, doth ſo forcible prove the beatitude of *Iuſtinian*, that it alone may bee ſufficient in this cauſe. The Cardinall cites but one part of the text, but the whole doth manifeſt his fraud and malicious collection. Apoc. 14.13. *Bleſſed are the dead which die in the Lord, from hence forth; even ſo ſaith the Spirit, for they reſt from their labours, and opera illorum ſequuntur illos*, their workes follow them: which laſt words the Cardinall onely alleageth, and applyeth them to *Iuſtinian*. Now who are Thoſe, that are meant by, *Their works*, and *follow Them?* who are thoſe *Them*, that the Spirit meaneth in that text? Out of al doubt thoſe ſelfe-ſame of whom before he ſpake, *Them, that dye in the Lord, Them, that are bleſſed, and reſt from their labours*; Of *Them*, the Spirit there ſaith, *Opera illorum*, Their workes follow *Them*. Seeing then the Cardinall confeſſeth this text to belong to *Iuſtinian*, and himſelfe applyeth it unto him, it certainly hence followeth, that

Iuſtinian is of their number, who dye in the Lord, and are bleſſed: for of *Them*, and *Them* onely doth the holy Ghoſt ſpeake in that text, ſaying, *They reſt from their labours, and* Their *workes follow* Them. So hard it is for the Cardinal to cite or ſay ought againſt *Iuſtinian*, which doth not redound to the Emperours honour, and the Cardinals owne ignominie.

44. But let us ſuppoſe the words to bee generall, as being uttered alone, without any reference to that text, they may bee truly affirmed both of the good & bad: There cannot be found in al Scripture more faire evidence, nor a more authentike Charter for the happy eſtate of any one in particular that lived ſince the Apoſtles times, then is this for *Iuſtinian*: For what were thoſe *workes which did accompanie and follow Iuſtinian?* Truely the workes of ſincere faith, of fervent zeale to GOD, of love to the Church and Children of God, the workes of piety, of prudence, of juſtice, of fortitude, of munificence, of many other heroicall vertues: with theſe, as with a garment and chaine of pure Gold, *Iuſtinian* being decked, was brought unto the Bridegroom; every decree made, or ratified by him for confirming the faith; every *Anathema* denounced againſt hereſies, & heretiks, particularly thoſe againſt *Vigilius*, & al that defend him, that is, againſt *Baronius*, and all who defend the Popes infallibility in defining cauſes of faith; everie Temple or Church, every Monaſtery and Hoſpitall, every City and Towne, everie Bridge, Haven and High-way, every Caſtle, Fort, and Munition, whether made or repaired by him, tending either immediately to the advancement of Gods ſervice, or to the maintaining or relieving of Gods ſervants, or ſtrengthning the Empire againſt his and Gods enemies: every booke in the Digeſt, Code, and Authentikes; every Title, yea, every law in any title, whereby either the Chriſtian faith and religion, or peaceable order and tranquillity, have beene either planted, or propagated, or continued, either in the Church or Common-wealth: all theſe, and every one of them, and many other the like, which I cannot either remember, or recount, are like ſo many Rubies, Chryſolites, and Diamonds in the coſtly garment, or ſo many linkes in that golden chaine of his faith and vertues. Seeing they, *who offer but one mite into the treaſury of the Lord*, or give *but one cup of cold water to a Prophet, ſhall not want a reward*; O! what a weight of eternity and glory ſhall that troope of vertues and traine of good workes obtaine at his hands, who *rewardeth indeed every man according to their workes*, but withall rewardeth them infinitely above all the dignity or condignity of their workes.

45. If *Iuſtinian* and thoſe who are beautified with ſo many vertues and glorious works, be, as the Card. judgeth, tormented in hell, belike the Cardinall himſelfe hoped by workes contrary unto theſe, by workes of infidelity, of impiety, of maligning the Church, of reviling the ſervants of GOD, of oppugning the faith, of Patronizing hereſie, yea, that fundamental hereſie which overthroweth the whole Catholike faith, and brings in a totall Apoſtaſie from the faith; by theſe hee hoped to purchaſe, and in condignity to merit the felicity of the Kingdome of Heaven: This being the track and beaten path where-

in

in they walke, and by which they aspire to immortality, what *Constantine* [m] sayd once to *Acesius* the Novatian, the same may be sayd to *Baronius* and his consorts, *Erigito tibi scalam Baroni, & ad cælum solus ascendito*, Keepe that Ladder unto your selves, and by it doe you alone climbe up into heaven. But well were it with them, and thrice happy had the Cardinall beene, if with a faithfull and upright heart towards God, he could have said of *Iustinian* the words of *Balaam*, *Let me dye the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his.* His life being led in piety, and abounding in good workes, hee now enjoyeth the fruit thereof, felicity and eternall rest in *Abrahams* bosome: As for the Cardinall who hath so malignantly reviled him, himselfe can now best tell whether he doth not cry and pray, *Father Abraham have mercy on me, and send Iustinian that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and coole my tongue*: or sing that other note [n] unto his fellowes concerning this Emperour; *Wee fooles thought his life to be madnesse, and his end to bee without honour, but now is he numbred among the children of God, and his lot is among the Saints: Therefore wee have erred from the way of truth, and wearied our selves in the wayes of wickednesse and destruction; we have gone through deserts where there lay no way, but as for the way of the Lord wee have not knowne it.*

m Socr. lib. 1. ca. 7.

n *Wisd.* 5. 4. &c.

Cap. XXI.

How Baronius *revileth* Theodora *the Empresse, and a refutation of the same.*

1. NExt the Emperour, let us see how dutifully the Cardinall behaveth himselfe towards the Empresse *Theodora*. A small matter it is with him in severall places to call her an [a] *impious*, an *heretical* [b], a *sacrilegious* [c], a *furious* [d] *hereticall* woman, a *patrone* [e] *of heretikes*, and the like. Heare and consider how he stormeth but in one place [f] against her: *These so great mischiefes did that most wicked woman beginne; she became to her husband another Eve obeying the serpent, a new Dalila to Samson, striving by her subtiltie to weaken his strength; another Herodias, thirsting after the blood of most holy men; a wanton mayd of the High Priest, perswading Peter to deny Christ.* But this is not enough, *Sugillare ipsam, with these termes to flout her*, who exceedeth all women in impiety, *let her have a name taken from Hell, let her be called Alecto, or Megera, or Tisiphone, a Citizen of hell, a childe of Devills, ravished with a satanicall spirit, driven up and downe with a devillish gad-bee, an enemy of concord and peace purchased with the blood of Martyrs.* Thus the Cardinall: who tells us afterwards how when *Vigilius* came to *Constantinople*, she contended long with him for to have *Anthimus* restored, in so much that *Vigilius* was forced to smite her as from heaven, with the thunderbolt of Excommunication [g], whereupon she [h] shortly dyed. Here is the tragicall end which the Cardinall hath made of her.

a *Impiæ Theodoræ Augustæ. an.* 535. *nu.* 59.
b *Hæreticæ fœminæ impiæ Theodoræ. ibid. nu.* 60.
c *Sacrilega fœmina mota est. an.* 536. *nu.* 123.
d *A furente hæretica fœmina excitata. an.* 538. *nu.* 9.
e *Ipsa hæreticorum, Acephalorum, Severianorum, Eutychianorum patrona. an.* 547. *nu.* 49.
f *An.* 535. *nu.* 63.
g *Sententiam excommunicationis inflixit. et, Excommunicationis sententia fulminis instar cœlitus emissa prostravit. an.* 547. *nu.* 49. & 50.
h *Theodoram à Vigilio sanctam dito jaculo anathematis, haud diu post ulciscente numine, est insequutus interitus. an.* 548. *nu.* 24.

2. Now

2. Now I would not have any think that I intend wholly to excuse the Empresse; she had her passions and errors; as who hath not? and as *Liberatus* [i] and *Evagrius* [k] shew, she tooke part with the oppugners of the Councell of Chalcedon: which was for some time true; shee being, as it seemes, seduced by *Anthimus*, whom for a while she laboured to have restored to the See of *Constantinople*: though afterwards, as *Victor Tununensis* testifieth, she being better informed, joyned with the Emperor in condemning the *Three Chapters*, and so in truth, in defending the Councell of *Chalcedon*, though *Victor* thought the contrarie. And of this minde in condemning the *three Chapters* shee was, as by *Victor* is evident, some yeares before *Vigilius* came to *Constantinople*. Her former error, seduction, and labour for *Anthimus*, I will not seeke to lessen, or any way excuse. But though she were worthy of blame, was it fit for the Cardinall so basely to revile her, and in such an unseemly and undutifull manner, to disgorge the venome of his stomacke upon an Empresse? *tanta ne animis cœlestibus iræ*, who would have thought such rancour and poison to have rested in the brest of a Cardinall? But there was, you may be sure, some great cause which drew from the Cardinall so many unseemly speeches against the Empresse; and though hee would bee thought to doe all this onely out of zeale to the truth, which *Anthimus* the heretike oppugned, yet if the depth of the Cardinalls heart were sounded, it will appeare, that his spite against her, was for condemning the *Three Chapters*, which Pope *Vigilius* in his *Constitution* defendeth; *Anthimus* and his cause is but a pretence and colour; the *Apostolicall Constitution*, the heresies of the Nestorians, decreed and defined therein, that is the true marke at which the Cardinall aymeth; neither Emperour nor Empresse, nor Bishop, nor Councell, nor any may open their mouth against that Constitution, which toucheth them *in capite*, but they shall be sure to heare and beare away as harsh and hellish termes from *Baronius*, as if they had condemned the *Trent* Councell it selfe. Had *Theodora* defended the *Three Chapters*, as *Vigilius* in his *Constitution* did, the Cardinall would have honoured her as a *Melpomene*, *Clio*, or *Vrania*; becausse she did not that, she must be nothing but *Alecto*, *Megara*, or *Tisiphone*, and they are too good names for her.

3. If one desired to set forth her praise, there wants not testimonies of her dignity, and honour. *Constantinus Manasses* [l] saith, that she was *Iisdem addicta cum marito studiis, & iisdem pradita moribus*: that she so well consorted to her husband, *that shee was addicted to the same studies, indued with the same manners as he was*: That *Iustinian* himselfe calleth her [m], *reverendissimam conjugem, his most reverend wife*, given unto him by God: adding that he tooke her as a partner with him of his counsells in making his lawes, and after her death he [n] calleth her *Augustam pia memoriæ, Empresse of holy memorie*, as doe also and very often the sixt general [o] Councell: an unfit title to be given to an heretike, or a fury, either by a holy generall Councell, or by a Christian orthodox Emperour, who was so earnest with the fift Councell to condemne all that should obstinately persist in the condemning of the true faith, and dye out of the communion of the holy Church. Divers the

i Liber. ca. 21, 22.

k Evagr. lib. 4. ca. 10.

l *In annal. suis. pa. 87.*

m *Participem consilij sumentes eam quæ à Deo est data nobis, reverendissimam conjugem. Novel. 8. ca. 1.*

n *In pragmatica sanctione Justin. ca. 1.*

o *Ad Iustinianū & Theodoram divæ memoriæ. Conc. gen. 6. Act. 14. pa. 73. Bis ita ait Concilium. &, Ad Theodoram piæ memoriæ quondam Augustam. Act. 3 pa. 11.*

the like teſtimonies might be alledged, if one would labour to extoll that Empreſſe, as the Cardinall hath ſtrained his wit and pen to vilifie and diſgrace her. But becauſe that is not my purpoſe at this time, I would onely obſerve how unjuſtly the Cardinall hath taxed her in reſpect of three ſeverall times, and three ſpeciall matters.

4. The firſt concernes the placing of *Anthimus*, an Eutychean heretike in the See of *Conſtantinople*, which *Baronius* [p] ſaith was done by *Iuſtinian, occultis inſidiis Theodoræ, by the cunning and trecherous meanes of Theodora*; and thereupon hee breakes [q] into many uncivill termes. Wherein the Cardinalls ſpite and indiſcretion is utterly unexcuſable: for whatſoever *Anthimus* was ſecretly and in his heart, he at that time when he was placed in the See, and afterwards alſo, outwardly ſhewed and profeſſed himſelfe to bee a Catholike; he was a wolfe, as the *Archimandrites* [r] and Monkes of *Conſtantinople, Ieruſalem*, and other parts of the Eaſt doe witneſſe, in their ſynodall Epiſtles to *Agapetus*; but he covered himſelfe, and his wolviſh conditions, under ſheepes clothing. Againe, hee [s] and others, *religionis pietatem diſſimulantes, counterfeiting the piety of religion*, thruſt themſelves into the Church. *Anthimus* lived not an Euangelicall (that is, ſincere,) *ſed fictam vitam, but a fained and hypocriticall life*, manifeſting forth to all men the counterfeit continency of his government, and the ſhew of piety which by it he made. The Emperour [t] teſtifieth the ſame; *Anthimus forſooke and refuſed thoſe true doctrines which hee often ſeemed to love, ſimulans ſequi ſanctas quatuor Synodos, faining himſelfe to follow the foure holy Synods.* The whole generall Councell under [u] *Mennas* in their definitive ſentence againſt *Anthimus* do expreſly witneſſe the ſame, *He counterfeited himſelfe to embrace and receive the foure Councells*, and he kept them *in dipticis*. Againe, he uſed *deceptibilibus rationibus ad ejus Serenitatem, deceitfull and cozening meanes before the Emperour*, promiſing to doe all things which the *Apoſtolike* See (then Catholike) did decree, and hee writ to the moſt holy Patriarchs, *Se ſequi per omnia Apoſtolicam ſedem, that he did in all things follow the Apoſtolike See*: when *Anthimus* made ſo holy, and orthodoxall a profeſſion, better than which no Catholike could deſire; what marvell if by this faire ſhew, and outward orthodoxy, hee deceived both the Emperour, and the Empreſſe, and the whole Church? They were not, nor could they looke into his heart, it was their duty to judge him to bee ſuch in deed, as he ſhewed and profeſſed himſelfe to be, a Catholike Biſhop: and taking him for ſuch, they placed him in that high Patriarchall See. Did not *Conſtantine* the great the like, and without any juſt blame or reprehenſion, receiving into great favour *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*, and others, though inwardly and in heart moſt peſtilent Arians, yet in outward profeſſion orthodoxall, and embracers of the Nicene faith? Nay, what if *Baronius* himſelfe acknowledge, that neither *Theodora* nor *Iuſtinian*, advanced *Anthimus* the heretike; but *Anthimus* then ſeeming, and being in their judgement a Catholike? Heare I pray you his owne words [x], *The Empreſſe favoured Anthimus, uti orthodoxo, as an orthodoxall Biſhop*: and *Iuſtinian* ſent a Conſtitution to him, *ut orthodoxũ Antiſtitem, as to an orthodoxal Biſhop. He did* [y] *outwardly profeſſe the Catholike faith, but inwardly*

p *Iuſtinianus Auguſtam conjugem audiens, monſtrum horrendum in ſedem Pontificiam provehit. an. 535. nu. 60.*

q *Ibid. nu. 62. & 63.*

r *Libell. Archimand. et Monac ad Agapetum in Conc. Conſtantinop. ſub Menn. act. 1. pa. 426. a.*

s *Pa. eadem. b.*

t *Iuſtin. Conſtitutio contra Severum, Anthimum. &c. quæ extat poſt Conc. ſub Menna. pa. 469. a.*

u *Sent. Synodi contra Anthimũ. act. 4. pa. 438. a.*

x *an. 535. nu. 62.*

y *an. eod. nu. 59.*

was

[1] an. cod. nu. 86

was an Eutychean. Againe, the [1] Fox had ſo ordered himſelfe, that being a moſt abominable heretike, *Studeret tamen in omnibus apparere Catholicus, yet he endeavoured every way to ſeeme a Catholike*, approving the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and all that true Catholikes did; yea and when there was a rumour ſpred of him to bee an heretike, the crafty companion throughly purged himſelfe of that crime, when in plaine termes he profeſſed before the Emperour, that he would in all things aſſent to what the Apoſtolike See did preſcribe: theſe things being diſſembled by *Anthimus*, his hypocriſie and hereſie were not deteted, untill [2] *Agapetus* the next yeare came to *Conſtantinople*; in the meane ſpace he was held for a profeſſor of the Catholike faith, a communicator with the Apoſtolike See, by reaſon of his publike profeſſion, wherein he openly before all mens eyes, and before the Emperor himſelfe, profeſſed to receive all things which the Apoſtolike See did preſcribe. Thus *Baronius*. By whoſe words it is moſt cleare that *Anthimus*, when hee was placed in that See of Conſtantinople by the meanes of the Empreſſe, was not knowne to her, nor diſcovered to the Church, as yet, to be an heretike, nor a full yeare after: hee was held & reputed by all for a Catholike, and very orthodoxall Biſhop. What fault was this now in *Theodora* or *Iuſtinian*, to place him in this See, whom they knew for no other than a Catholike? who profeſſed to hold the foure former Councels, and promiſed to yeeld to whatſoever *Agapetus* a knowne Catholike did preſcribe. Nay, ſeeing by *Baronius* owne confeſſion, the Empreſſe did then favour him *uti orthodoxo, no otherwiſe than as being orthodoxall*, ſhe even therein teſtified her orthodoxy in faith at that time, as favouring him *eo nomine*, becauſe ſhe thought him to be orthodoxall. So farre was ſhe in this act either from being an heretike, or deſerving thoſe epithetes & titles, w^ch^ the Cardinall hath fetcht from hell to beſtow upon her, that in very deed by the Cardinals words ſhe deſerveth praiſe and honour.

[2] *Ibid. nu. 88.*

5. The ſecond point concernes the bienniall contention with *Vigilius* for reſtoring of *Anthimus*, which out of *Anaſtaſius* [b] *Baronius* [c] hath borrowed: all which is nothing but a meere fiction and legend patched up by *Anaſtaſius*, as elſewhere I ſhall further explaine. *Vigilius* was neither called, nor came about that buſineſſe to *Conſtantinople*, but about the *three Chapters*; the cauſe of *Anthimus* was ſome ten yeares before ended: the Empreſſe knew the reſolution of *Vigilius* therein, that he had abſolutely refuſed to reſtore him. And though for a while after the depoſition of *Anthimus*, ſhee, being deceived by his faire words and ſhew of piety, ſought to reſtore him: yet when ſhee ſaw *Anthimus* to remaine an obſtinate heretike, and to oppugne the faith of *Chalcedon*, ſhee quite left off all ſtriving for *Anthimus*, and became with *Iuſtinian* a condemner of the *three Chapters*, (as *Victor* [c] teſtifieth) that is in truth, an earneſt defender of the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and of the Catholike faith. So unjuſtly doth the Cardinall take occaſion upon an untruth and legendary fable to revile the Empreſſe as an heretike.

[b] *Anaſt. in vita Vigil.*

[c] *an. 547. nu. 49*

[c] *Theodora elicuit à Vigilio ut tria Capitula condemnaret. Vict. Tun. in Chron. an. 2. poſt Coſſ. Baſily.*

6. The third and laſt point concernes the direfull thunderblaſt of Excommunication, which *Vigilius* the Romane *Iupiter* caſt from hea-

ven

ven againſt *Theodora*, wherewith belike ſhe was ſmit to death. Where-in though the Cardinall [d] is exceeding brag, and thinkes his ſaying to be warranted by no meane witneſſes, but by Pope *Gregory* himſelfe; yet for all that, I muſt be bold to tell him that it alſo is a fiction, and that *Vigilius* brought no ſuch Ioviall darts with him to *Conſtantinople*, or if he did, he ſpent them not upon the Empreſſe. It was Pope *Agapetus*, and not *Vigilius*, by whom (if by any) *Theodora* was excommunicated, ſeeing *Theodora* did contend with *Agapetus* about *Anthimus*, and that alſo before his depoſition. It was he which called *Theodora*, *Eleutheria*, a perſecuting Empreſſe. *Vigilius* had no occaſion at his comming to excommunicate her, the cauſe of *Anthimus* was before that ended. *Theodora* and *Vigilius* conſented together in one profeſſion of faith: he condemning the *three Chapters*, a little after he came to *Conſtantinople*, as well as the Empreſſe, could not condemne or excommunicate her for an heretike, but hee muſt condemne himſelfe alſo. I, but Pope *Gregory* [e] ſaith expreſly he did excommunicate her. Might I in ſtead of an anſwer ſay as ſome [f] of their owne Writers do in another cauſe, *Gregorius hîc non eſt audiendus, Gregory is here not to bee regarded*: or but ſay as their owne Biſhop *Canus* [g] doth, that *Gregory* was too credulous in writing reports; the matter were ſoone anſwered: But I am not willing to cenſure *Gregory* ſo hard as they doe: my anſwer is, that the name of *Vigilius* is by an error either of the writer or Printer of *Gregory*, inſerted there in ſtead of *Agapetus*: for of *Agapetus*, *Victor* [h] is an expreſſe witneſſe, that he indeed deprived *Theodora* of the communion: All the circumſtances accord thereunto. *Theodora* was then an enemy to the Councell of *Chalcedon*, ſhe tooke part, and was a patron of *Anthimus*: *Gregory* himſelfe notes this fact to be done equally againſt the whole ſect [i] of the Acephalian heretikes, as againſt *Theodora*: now *Vigilius* had nothing to doe with thoſe heretikes; it was the cauſe of the *three Chapters* wherewith hee was troubled; the heads of the *Acephali*, *Anthimus*, *Severus*, *Petrus*, *Zoaras*, and their followers, were condemned both by *Agapetus* [k], and by the great Councell of *Conſtantinople* [l] under *Mennas*, where were preſent the Legates of the Romane See, *Agapetus* being lately dead: and the ſame ſentence was confirmed by the Emperour *Iuſtinian* [m] at the end of the Synod, ſo that there was nothing left for *Vigilius* to doe againſt the *Acephali*, who both by the *Pontificall*, *Synodall*, and *Imperiall* ſentence were condemned nine yeares before his comming to *Conſtantinople*. Laſtly, the very ſcope and coherence of *Gregories* text doth inforce this correction. The defenders of the *three Chapters* alledged, that ſince the time of the fift Councell, wherein the *three Chapters* were condemned, many calamities had befalne *Italy*, whereupon they concluded that God afflicted the Church for that decree of the fift Councell, and for condemning of thoſe *three Chapters*. *Gregory* to refute this their reaſon, alledged another example, and of former times: to wit, of condemning the *Acephali*, whom they, to whom *Gregory* writ, acknowledged for heretikes; ſaying, *Poſtquam*, after Pope *Agapetus* when he came into this kingly City denounced a ſentence of condemnation, againſt *Theodora*, and the *Acephali*, then was *Rome* beſieged, and taken by the enemies

d *Ibid.*

e *Greg. lib. 2. Epiſt. 36.*

f *Author. apol. Tumultuariæ pro diſpenſatione de matrim. Hen. 8. & uxoris fratris ejus. fol. 46.*

g *De loc. Theol. lib. 11. ca. 6. §. Lex vero 2.*

h *Agapetus Archiepiſcop. Rom. Theodoram Auguſtam Anthimi patronam communione privat: Anthimum deponit, & Mennam ejus loco Epiſcopum ponit. Victor. Tunun. in Chron. in Coſſ. Iuſtin. an. 14. Iuſtiniani.*

i *Papa, contra Theodoram & Acephalos damnationis ſententiam promulgavit. Greg. loco citato.*

k *Acephalorum Principes, Anthimum, Severũ, &c. condemnavit Agapetus. Bin. Not. in vitam Agapet. pa. 416. b.*

l *Act. 5.*

m *Conſt. Juſtin. poſt finem Synod. ſub Menna.*

enemies (that is the Gothes;) was therefore God angry for that sentence against the *Acephali*? Apply this reason to *Vigilius*, and his time, and it is not onely untrue, but unfit to the purpose of *Gregory*: for before *Vigilius* his comming to *Constantinople*, not only *Vitiges* the Goth possessed *Rome*, (from whom *Belisarius* in the time of *Silverius* recovered it) and made great havocke in *Italy*; but *Totilas* [n] also (before *Vitiges* came) besieged it so hard, that by reason of the famine they were driven not onely to eate mice, and dogs, but even dung also, and last of all one to eate up another: and that same yeare *Totilas* tooke *Rome*, sacked it, and had purposed utterly to have abolished it, and burnt it to ashes, but that *Belisarius* by his most prudent and fortunate perswasions, staid him from that barbarous immanity. Now seeing not onely the siege, but captivity of *Rome* was after the comming of that Pope to *Constantinople*, and sentence against *Theodora*, of whom *Gregory* speaketh, it must needs be hee meant Pope *Agapetus*, whose sentence all the foresaid calamities follow; and not *Vigilius*, [o] before whose comming to *Constantinople Rome* was besieged by *Totilas*, and taken also before the sentence, if it was (as by *Anastasius* is to be gathered) not denounced till the second yeare after *Vigilius* his comming thither. Neither onely had the reason of *Gregory* beene untrue, but most unfit for his purpose, had he meant *Vigilius* in this place: for hee clearly intends such a calamity as hapned before the condemning of the *three Chapters*, but after the condemning of the *Acephali*. Now it is certaine by the Acts of the fift Councell, and by the Emperours testimony, that as the Easterne Bishops, so also *Vigilius* presently after he came to *Constantinople* consented to condemne the *three Chapters*, yea condemned them by a *Pontificall* decree and judgement, and continued in that minde till the time of the fift Councell; at which time by the general Synod they were also condemned. *Gregory* then should have spoken against himselfe, had hee meant *Vigilius*, and his comming to *Constantinople*, in saying that after the sentence of *Vigilius* against *Theodora*, the City was besieged and taken, (as it was once againe indeed taken by *Totilas* [p] in the 23. yeare of *Iustinus*:) for his adversaries to whom he writ, being defenders of the *three Chapters*, would have replyed against him, that this calamity befell them from the very same cause; seeing both the Easterne Bishops and the Pope consented in that doctrine of condemning of the *three Chapters*. Thus it appeareth not by surmises and conjectures, but by certaine and evident proofe, that the text of *Gregory* is corrupted, or else that *Gregory* himselfe was mistaken therein, (which in a matter so neare his dayes wee may not thinke) and so that it was not *Vigilius*, but *Agapetus* whom *Gregory* intended to denounce that sentence against the *Acephali*, or *Theodora*, of which *Baronius* maketh such boast, and commends with such great ostentation, that thereby he might make the Empresse who was a condemner of the *three Chapters*, more odious, and strengthen that fiction and fabulous tale of *Anastasius*, that *Vigilius* contended with *Iustinian* and *Theodora* about *Anthimus*.

[n] *Totilas Romam contendit, quam statim obsedit. Proc. lib. 3. de bell. Goth. pa. 360.*

[o] *Vigilius venit Constantinopolin. an. 12. belli Gothic. Proc. lib. eodem. pa. 364. Romam obsedit Totilas. an. 11. ejusdem belli. lib. eodem. pa. 359. & seq.*

[p] *Proc. lib. eodē 3. an. 15. belli Goth. pa. 394.*

CAP.

CAP. XXII.

How Baronius *declameth againſt* the cauſe it ſelfe of the Three Chapters, *and a refutation thereof.*

1. BAronius not content to wrecke his ſpite upon the Emperour and Empreſſe in ſuch uncivill manner as you have ſeene, carpes in the next place at the very cauſe it ſelfe of the *three Chapters. What did Vigilius*, ſaith hee [a], *offend, in appointing that men ſhould be ſilent and ſay nothing untill the future Synod, of this cauſe of the three Chapters?* which if it could have beene, *potius perpetuo erat ſilentio condemnanda, ſopienda, ſepelienda, atque penitus extinguenda; was rather to be condemned to perpetuall ſilence, to be buried and utterly extinguiſhed.* Againe [b], *I doe never feare to avouch that it had beene much better that the Church had remained without theſe controverſies* (about the *three Chapters*) *nec unquam de his aliquis habitus eſſet ſermo, and that there had never beene one word ſpoken of them.* Thus *Baronius*. a Bar. an. 547. nu. 48. b an. 553. n. 137

2. What thinke you moved the Cardinall to have ſuch an immortall hatred to this cauſe, as to wiſh the condemning, buriall, and utter extinguiſhing of thoſe controverſies? What more hurt did this to the Church, than the queſtion about ὁμόσιον, about ὁμοιούσιος, or about the opinion of *Eutiches*? Very great calamity, ſaith *Baronius* [c], inſued upon this controverſie, both in the Eaſt and Weſt. True, it did ſo: and ſo there did, and far greater and longer about the controverſie of ὁμόσιον: and more againe than that, upon the queſtion whether the *Goſpell* or *Paganiſme* ſhould prevaile: and yet by moving thoſe controverſies was the faith propagated, the truth of Chriſt ſpred abroad, the blood of Martyrs was made the ſeed of the Goſpell. No affliction, calamity, or perſecution, is a juſt cauſe either to wiſh that there had never beene any ſuch controverſie, or to forſake the truth of God, when the controverſie is moved. It was an excellent ſaying of the Ægyptian Biſhops in the Councell of *Chalcedon* [d], *Chriſtianus neminem timet, a Chriſtian feareth no mortall man; ſi homines timerentur, martyres non eſſent, if men ſhould be feared, there would be no Martyrs.* But the truth is, it was not as *Baronius* fancieth, the controverſie it ſelfe, nor the diſputing and debating thereof, that cauſed ſo great calamities in the Eaſt and Weſt; that is *non cauſa pro cauſa*; the peeviſhneſſe and perverſeneſſe of wicked men maintaining hereſies, and oppugning the truth, that was the true cauſe thereof. The controverſie it ſelfe, if you well marke it, was very beneficiall to the Church. *Oportet hæreſes* [e] *eſſe, there muſt be hereſies among you, that they which are approved might be knowne.* Every hereſie is a probation and tryall of mens love to God, and his truth, whether they eſteeme it more than their honours, pleaſures, and their owne wilfull conceits; and the greater the hereſie is, and the further it ſpreads, it is ſtill a greater tryall. *Heretikes*, ſaith S. *Auſten* [f], *doe much profit the Church, though they be out of the Church, not* c *Ibidem.* d Act. 1. pa. 8. e 1 Cor. 11. 19. f *Lib. de vera relig. ca. 8.*

by teaching the truth which they doe not know, but by ſtirring up thoſe who are more carnall Catholikes, to ſeeke, and thoſe who are more ſpirituall, to defend and manifeſt the truth. This triall and probation of men (if I miſtake not) was never ſo great in any controverſie or queſtion, as in this of the *three Chapters*. Firſt, it ſifted and tryed *Vigilius* to the full, and tryed him to be a wether-cocke in faith, an heretike, and a defender of hereſies even by his *Apoſtolicall* authority. Next, it ſifted out divers notable concluſions: as firſt, that which I think was never before that tryed; that not onely the Pope, but the *Apoſtolike* See alſo, to wit, the Romane Church, and with it the Weſterne Churches, all at once adhered to hereſie, and forſooke the truth, and that even after it was decreed, and judged by the generall approved Councell; and ſo it proved both Pope and Romane Church to be properly hereticall, the Eaſterne Churches conſtantly upholding the truth at that time; it ſhewed that the Catholike faith was tied neither to the Chair, nor Church of *Rome*. Another concluſion then tryed, was that either perſons, or Churches, may not onely diſſent from the Pope and the Romane Church, and that in a cauſe of faith judicially defined by the Pope with a Synod, but may renounce communion with them, and yet remaine Catholikes, and in the unity of the Catholike Church; the Pope, the Weſterne Church, and all that adheered unto them being then by forſaking the Catholike faith, *Heretikes*, and by forſaking the unity of the Church, *Schiſmatikes*.

3. Neither onely was this controverſie a triall to them in that age; a tryall of their faith, love to God, charity to the Church, obedience to the Emperour, but it is as great a triall even in theſe our dayes, and ever ſince that doctrine of the Popes *infallibility* in cauſes of faith hath beene defined and condemned. By this controverſie, moſt happly decided by the generall Councell, all that hold the Popes definitions of faith to be *infallible*, that is, all that are Papiſts, or members of the preſent Church of Rome, they are all hereby tryed to defend this *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution* of *Vigilius*, that is, to maintaine all the blaſphemies of the Neſtorians, to deny the Catholike faith, the doctrine of the Apoſtles, of the primative Church, of the fift generall Councell; & ſo to be not only *heretikes*, but *convicted*, *anathematized*, and *cõdemned heretikes*, by the judgement of a generall approved Councell, and ſo by the conſenting judgement of the Catholike Church. Further yet there is a tryall of them, whether upon that ground or foundation of the Popes *infallibility*, they will build up and maintaine any other doctrine, or *poſition* of faith, or religion; if they doe (as indeed every point of the Romiſh faith and Religion relyeth upon that) they are againe hereby tryed to be hereticall, not onely in the *foundation*, but in every *poſition* and doctrine of their faith and religion, which relyes upon that *foundation*.

4. This was it which netled *Baronius*, and extorted from him thoſe earneſt and affectionate wiſhes, that this controverſie had never beene heard of, nor mentioned in the world: he ſaw what a tryall was like to be made by it of men, of doctrines, of Churches, of the Pope himſelfe, and their whole Romiſh Church; and ſeeing that tryall, he never

ver ceased to say, that it had beene much better that this controversie had never beene moved, nor spoken of, for so they had avoided this most notable triall. Blessed be God, for that it pleased him in the infinite depth of his unspeakable wisedome to cause this controversie to be ventilated, and discussed to the utmost; that among many other tryals, this might be one of the *Antichristian Synagogue*, to try them even untill the very destruction of Antichrist. It is for heretikes whose errors and obstinacy is tryed, and discovered to the world; it is for them, I say, to wish that the controversies about Arianisme, Nestorianisme, Eutycheanisme, and the like, had never beene moved; they had scaped the just censures and anathemaes by that meanes. But Catholikes have cause to rejoyce and triumph in such controversies, by which, both the truth which they maintaine, is made more resplendent and victorious, themselves, and their faith tryed to be like refined gold; the Church thereby is quieted, the truth propagated, heresies confounded, and the glory of Almighty God, much more magnified, and praysed.

a *An.534.n.23*
b *An.546.nu.9.*
c *Ibid.nu.8.*
d *Edere sanctiones sibi arrogat (Iustin.) quas dolose conscripsissent heretici. an.546.nu.41. Egerunt callide adversarii veritatis, &c. ibid. nu.9.*
e *Ingenue professus est, Origenistarum studia ea fuisse ab Imperatore promulgata. ibid nu.49.*
f *Illud à Theodoro conscriptum edictum suo nomine Iustin. promulgavit. ibid. nu.8.*
g *an.538.nu.85*
h *an.546. nu.9. & an.534.nn. 21. & alibi.*
i *Justin. factiosorum studijs se instruit. an.550. nu.14.*
k *Hominem vafrum. an. 551. nu. 4. & 564. nu.7.*
l *Ejus gratia factus impudens ibid.nu.3.*
m *Theodorum illum nequissimum quem mirum in modum faviſſe ostendimus Origenis hæresibus. an.564.nu.5. & occultum hæreticum, manifestum schismaticum. an.551. nu.5. Præceps Origenista. an. eod. nu.4.*

Cap. XXIII.

How Baronius *revileth both* the Imperiall Edict of *Iustinian*, *and* Theodorus B. of Cæsarea; *and a refutation of the same.*

1. Seeing now, notwithstanding the wishing of *Baronius*, this controversie could not be buried, (it ought him and all ill-willers of it a greater shame than that) in the next place let us see how he declameth both against the Emperors *Edict*, whereby these *three Chapters* were condemned, & *Theodorus Bish. of Cæsarea*, who (as he saith) was the author & penner of that Edict. The Edict it self he calleth first, *Seminarium* [a] *dissentionũ, a seed-plot of sedition*, which was never made upon a good occasion, nor had any good end. And not content herewith, he tells [b] us out of *Facundus*, *that it is contrary to the faith, yea even to that faith which Iustinian himselfe professed as orthodoxall*: to which effect also *Baronius* himselfe saith [c] *that the Emperours Edict was set forth contrary to the three Chapters of the most holy Councell of Chalcedon.* But he specially seekes to disgrace it by the author of it; for though it was published by *Iustinian*, yet saith he [d], *it was written, and that craftily by heretikes and adversaries to the truth*; by the [e] Origenists, and in particular by [f] *Theodorus* Bishop of *Cæsarea*, one gratious [g], potent, and familiar with the Emperour: and for proofe of all this the Cardinall citeth *Liberatus* [h], *Facundus*, and *Vigilius*.

2. Having thus declared *Theodorus* to be the author and writer of the *Edict*; *Baronius* then rageth against *Theodorus*, as if he were to act *veterẽ comœdiam*, or according to the Proverbe, *ex plaustro*, to raile out of a cart against him, calling him *factious* [i], *fraudulẽt* [k], *impudẽt* [l], *a most wicked* [m], *hereticall, schismaticall, headstrong Origenist*, the ring-leader of

the Origenists, one marvellously addicted to the heresie of *Origen*: nor onely a servant to *Origens* errors, *but also* [n] *a most earnest defender of the Eutychean blasphemy*; nor onely so, *but plunged* [o] *in the heresie of the Aphthardokites, or Phantastickes*, and like a blinde guide leading the blinde Emperour into that ditch of heresie: *a sacrilegious* [p] *person, a pseudobishop, a tyrant, a perverter of lawes, an overthrower of right, the* [q] *author of all mischiefe to the Empire, the very* [r] *plague of the whole Church*: Thus and much more doth *Baronius* utter against *Theodorus*, by whom being so unworthy an author, hee would disgrace the *Edict* it selfe, which he writ, though the Emperour published it.

n Non Origenis tantum errorum assecla, sed & Eutychianæ blasphemiæ vehementissimus propugnator. an. 564. nu. 7.

o Ita miser (Iustinianus) cæcus cæcum (Theodorum) sectans, cũ ipso pariter mergitur in profundum. an. 564. nu. 7. agit autẽ de hæresi Aphthardocbitarum.

p Inq; sacrilegum (Theodorum) pseudoepiscopum, imo tyrannum insurgit, in perversorem legum, eversorem juriũ. an. 551. nu. 5.

q Qui Imperatori omnium illi malorum causa fuit. an. 551. n. 31

r Hic igitur nefandissimus, totius Ecclesiæ pestis. an. 564. nu. 7.

3. Let us first begin with that most untrue and malicious calumny of *Baronius*, that the Emperor published his Edict against the *three Chapters* of the Councell of *Chalcedon*. Truly the Cardinall should and might most truly have said the quite contrary, that he published his Edict for defence not onely of the *three*, but of every Chapter, of every position, of every decree of the Councell of *Chalcedon*. The *three Chapters* which that Imperiall Edict, and after it the fift Councell, and the whole Catholike Church condemneth, were not Chapters of the Councell of *Chalcedon*, but three impious positions, assertions, or (as they were by an equivalent word called) Chapters, which heretikes, specially the Nestorians, collected, and falsely boasted to bee taught by the Councell of *Chalcedon*; whereas in very truth the holding of any one of them (much more of them all) is the overthrow of the whole Councell at *Chalcedon*, yea of the whole Catholike faith: that Councell contradicteth and condemneth them all, no lesse than the fift Councell, which as *Gregory* truly saith, is *in omnibus sequax*, it doth in every point follow and consent unto the Councell of *Chalcedon*. The like may be said of that which out of *Facundus*, *Baronius* observeth, and citeth as a proofe of his saying, that the Emperours *Edict* is repugnant and contrary to the orthodoxall faith. *Baronius* will still keepe his old wont in applauding *Vigilius* and the defenders of the *Three Chapters*. For if the *Edict* condemning them be contrary, then is the defence of them consonant to the faith, and then not the *Imperiall Edict of Iustinian*, but the Pontificall *Constitution* of *Vigilius* must be approved as orthodoxall. And what is this else, but to condemne the judgement of the fift generall Councell, of Pope *Pelagius*, *Gregory*, and all Popes after them, of all generall Councells following it; in a word, to contradict, and utterly condemne the consenting judgement of the whole Church, for the space of 11. hundred yeares? they all approve the determination of the fift Councell, and it so fully consenteth with the *Edict* in condemning the *Three Chapters*, that in their definitive sentence they differ very little in words, but in substance and sense nothing at all from the *Emperours Edict*, which caused *Binius* to say, the Edict of the Emperour was approved by the Pope and the Councell: So Catholike and orthodoxall is it, so advisedly and orthodoxally penned. To seeke no further proofe, *Baronius* himselfe was so infatuated in this cause, that he oftentimes confuteth his owne sayings: for himselfe gives a most ample and most observable testimony of this *Edict*, and of the orthodoxy thereof, saying [s] of it, *Est ve-*

s an. 534. nu. 21.

luti

luti Catechiſmus, & fidei Catholicæ exacta declaratio; this Edict of Iuſtinian is as it were a Catechiſme, or an exact declaration of the Catholike faith, and an exact diſcuſſing of the *Three Chapters*, which were afterwards long controverſed in the Church. So untrue is that his firſt calumnie againſt the *Edict*, whereby hee would perſwade, that it is contrary to certaine Chapters of the holy Councell of *Chalcedon*, or as *Facundus* plainly, but moſt untruely affirmeth, contrary to the Catholike faith.

4. For the ſecond calumnie, that his Edict was a ſeminary of ſedition, *Baronius* might as juſtly condemne the decree of *Nice*, of *Epheſus*, of *Chalcedon*, yea, the very Scripture it ſelfe, and preaching of the Goſpell; Chriſt himſelfe is ſet as *ſignum* [t] *contradictionis, as a butt of contradiction*, againſt which they will ever bee ſtriving, and ſhooting their arrowes of oppoſition, ſedition, & contention: himſelfe [u] ſaith, *I am come to ſet fire on the earth, and what would I but that it ſhould bee kindled:* and againe, *Suppoſe yee that I am come to give peace on the earth, I tell you nay, but rather diviſion*; and no ſooner was the Goſpell preached abroad in the world, but that which our Saviour foretold them [x], came to paſſe; *Brother ſhall deliver up brother, the father the Childe; the Children ſhall riſe againſt their Parents, and cauſe them to bee put to death; and ye ſhall be hated of all men for my names ſake:* what a ſeminary of ſedition may the Cardinal call the Goſpell, that cauſed all theſe troubles, warres, ſeditions, murders, and burnings in the whole world? what another Seminary was the Nicene decree againſt Arianiſme, and *Conſtantines Edict* to ratifie the ſame? after that, how ſeditiouſly was *Athanaſius* and the Catholikes perſecuted, put to flight, to torments, by *Conſtantius* and the Arians? how ſeditiouſly did the Councels of *Ariminum*, and *Syrmium* oppugne and fight againſt that Nicene Decree, till they had ſo farre prevailed, that well-neare there had needed no longer contending, the whole world almoſt being turned Arians, and even groaning under Arianiſme? It the Cardinall, by reaſon of thoſe manifold troubles and oppoſitions, which enſued upon this *Edict*, will condemne it for being a Seminary of ſedition; let him firſt condemne the Nicene Decree, and Imperiall *Edict* for it, let him condemne the Goſpell, and Chriſt himſelfe, which were all ſuch Seminaries as that *Edict* was. If notwithſtanding all the oppoſitions, ſeditions, & cõtentions rayſed by heathen, heretical, & other wicked men, againſt theſe, they were (as moſt certainly they were) Seminaries of truth; let the Card. know & acknowledge his malicious ſlander againſt this moſt religious and *orthodox all Edict* of *Iuſtinian*, which was, as all the former, a ſacred Sanctuary for the Catholike faith. Seditions, oppoſitions, tumults, perſecutions, and the like diſturbances in the Church, ſpring not from Chriſt, nor from his Word and Goſpel, either preached by Biſhops, or decreed by Councels, or confirmed by *Imperiall Edicts*, all theſe are of themſelves cauſes onely of unity, concord, peace, and agreement in the Church; theſe onely are the proper, native, and naturall fruits, and effects that proceed from them; but contentions and ſeditions come from the perverſe, froward, wicked, and malicious mindes of men, that hate the truth, and in hatred

[t] *Luk.* 2. 34.

[u] *Luk.* 12. 49, 51

[x] *Mat.* 10. 21.

of it fight againſt all that uphold the truth, bee it by preaching, by decreeing, or by enacting the truth, theſe are as Wolves, which by continuall tumbling in the mire diſturbe and trouble theſtreame: The fountaines whence the truth ſpringeth are moſt pure and moſt peaceable.

5. Now whereas in the third place *Baronius* ſeekes to diſgrace the *Edict*, by the Author of it, whom he deſcribes to have beene not onely an heretike, but a moſt deteſtable perſon, even the plague of the whole Church, let us ſuppoſe and admit the Author to have beene ſuch a man indeed, nay, to have beene *Iudas* himſelfe, (and worſe than *Iudas* hee could hardly bee, ſeeing CHRIST himſelfe called [y] *Iudas* a Devill,) Is the *Edict*, or the truth of God thereby publiſhed, worſe, becauſe *Iudas* uttered or penned it? was the Arke to bee refuſed or contemned, becauſe wicked men framed and built it? Did not Chriſt ſay [z] of *Iudas*, (a Devill) as well as of *Peter* a Saint, *Hee that heareth you heareth mee, he that deſpiſeth you deſpiſeth me?* Hath *Baronius* forgotten the leſſon of Saint *Iames* [a], *My brethren, have not the faith of our glorious Lord Ieſus Chriſt in reſpect of perſons*; love it for it ſelfe, but neither love it nor refuſe it becauſe of him that ſpeaketh, penneth, or bringeth the ſame? Did the Cardinall never heare of the Scribes and Phariſees, *they ſit* [b] *in Moſes chaire*, (that is, deliver Gods truth out of *Moſes* and the Prophets unto you) *whatſoever therefore they bid you, that obſerve, doe, but after their workes doe not?* Or if this reaſon of the Cardinall may take effect, themſelves, and their Romane Church will be farre the greateſt looſers; how eaſie will it be to reject and contemne an whole Volume of their Pontificall Edicts? why, this was made or written by *Iohn* 12. that by *Hildebrand*, or *Boniface* 8. the other by *Iohn* 23. an heretike, an Atheiſt, a Devill incarnate, as a generall Councell [c] teſtifieth; another by *Formoſus*, *Steven*, or by one of thoſe whom themſelves profeſſe to have beene theeves, robbers, Wolves, Tygers, and moſt ſavage beaſts, and Apoſtaticall Popes, as *Genebrard* [d] calleth threeſcore of them, all worſe than the Author of this *Imperiall Edict*, though wee ſhould admit him to have beene ſuch, or as bad every way as *Baronius* deſcribeth him.

y *Iohn* 6. v. 71.

z *Luk.* 10. 16.

a *Iam.* 2 v. 1.

b *Mat.* 23. v. 2, 3

c *Iohannes* 23. *inter Chriſti fideles vitas ac mores ejus cognoſcentes, vulgariter dicitur Diabolus incarnatus. Conc. Conſtant. ſeſſ.* 11. *pa.* 1579.

d *Per annos ferè* 150. *Pontifices ferè* 50. *à virtute majorum prorſus defecerunt, Apotactici, Apoſtaticivè, potius quam Apoſtolici, &c. Gen. lib.* 4. *Chronol. ad an.* 904.

6. But the truth is, the Author of the *Edict* was no ſuch man as the Cardinall fancieth: as it beares the name, ſo it was indeed the worke of *Iuſtinian*, no childe can have more honour by his father, than it by ſuch an Emperour: and though *Baronius* having ſo often ſlandered *Iuſtinian*, to bee utterly rude, unlearned, one that could not ſo much as reade, nor knew his Alphabet or firſt elements, could not but in good congruity confidently deny *Iuſtinian* to bee the Writer, or Author of ſo learned and divine an *Edict*, or as himſelfe cals it, of ſo exact a Catechiſme; yet conſidering what before was declared, both out of *Procopius* of the Emperours often toſſing of bookes among the Biſhops, out of *Liberatus* of his great paines taken in writing againſt heretikes, and for defence of the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and out of *Platina* calling *Iuſtinian* a very learned Emperour: I cannot thinke but that although *Iuſtinian* might uſe the adviſe, helpe, and induſtry of

Mecnas,

Mennas, *Theodorus*, or some other Bishops in this as in other *Edicts*, concerning Ecclesiasticall affaires, yet still the *ultima manus*, the last correction and perfecting of all, was the Emperours owne doing, the rather because both in his other *Edicts*, that against *Anthimus*, against *Origen*, as also in his letters to this Synod, and the rest, there is so uniforme a stile, so Imperiall, and so divine a kinde of writing, that the same Genius of *Iustinian* seemes to breathe in them all.

7. But *Baronius* [e] tels us, that both *Liberatus*, *Facundus*, and *Vigilius* doe testifie *Theodorus* Bishop of *Cesarea* to bee the Author of this Edict. *Baronius* is ever like himselfe, that is, untrue, and fraudulent: Not one of these say it: first, not *Liberatus*, hee indeed *affirmes* [f] *Theodorus and some others to have suggested this unto the Emperour, that hee would condemne those Three Chapters, by a publike Edict or booke*; but hee addes withall, *Rogaverunt eum ut dictaret Libellum*; *they prayed the Emperour that he would dictate or indite the booke against the Three Chapters*; and the Emperour consented, saith *Liberatus* [g], unto them, *& hoc se lætus implere promisit, and he gladly promised to doe so*; that is, to indite or dictate such an *Edict*. So farre is *Liberatus* from affirming, as *Baronius* alleageth him, *Theodorus* to bee the Author of this booke or *Edict*, that hee teacheth the quite contrary. As for *Facundus* he [h] saith indeed, *the Edict was not written by Iustinian, but by the adversaries of the truth*: but that *Theodorus* writ it, that is the Cardinals addition, *Facundus* saith it not: and even in that which hee saith, that the *Edict* is contrary to the Emperours faith, *Facundus* doth so manifestly slander, both the Emperour, (as if hee thought the *Three Chapters* were not to be condemned,) and the *Edict* also, as if the condemning of these *Three Chapters* were contrary to the Catholike faith) that there is no credit at all to bee given to him in his report touching the Author, who is so untrue in his reports, both touching the matter of the *Edict*, and touching the knowne profession and faith of the Emperour.

e *An.* 546. nu. 89.

f *In suo Breviar. ca.* 24.

g *Annuit eis Princeps Ibid.*

h *Ea quæ scribi fecerunt, titulo nominis tui prænotarunt, verum nos illa scripta nolumus tua dici. Fac. apud Bar. an.* 546. *nu.* 9.

8. The Cardinals *Vigilius* now *remaineth*, whose words [i] are these spoken to *Theodorus*; The booke condemning the *Three Chapters*, by their meanes was read in the Kings Pallace, before certaine Greeke Bishops, *à quibus assentationum favorem tuis vocibus exigebas*: What if one should here oppose the Cardinall, and say, *tuis vocibus*, were the Ablative case, and that *Theodorus* had by his words sollicited, the other Bishops favorably to consent to the Emperors *Edict*? How will *Baronius* assure us, that they must bee taken in the Dative case; as if *Theodorus* had sollicited them to consent to his words, that is, as the Cardinall supposeth, to the *Edict* which was penned, and written by him, or whereof he was the Author? Sure against this Baronian construction, the words of *Liberatus* are very pregnant, seeing *Theodorus*, as heesheweth, was one who entreated the Emperour to indite or dictate the booke, and the Emperour promised so to doe. If then *Theodorus* sollicited the Bishops to consent to the words of the *Edict*, hee certainly urged them (by this testimonie of *Liberatus*) to consent not to his owne, but to the Emperours words, of whose inditing and dictating

i *Inter Epist. Vigily, Epist.* 17. *tom.* 2. *Conc. pa.* 503. *b.*

dictating the *Edict* was. Admit them to bee the Dative, how knowes the Cardinall, that by [*tuis vocibus*] are ment the words of the *Edict?* might not *Theodorus* signifie to the Bishops his owne great liking of the Emperours *Edict*, and perswade them to the like, to say as he said, to consent to his words in approving the *Imperiall Edict?* The Card. was too secure & negligēt in relying on these words [*tuis vocibus*] wch being so ambiguous, receive divers, & those also just exceptions: But yet there is a farre worse fault in this proofe; that the Epistle, whence the Cardinall citeth these words, though it beare the name of *Vigilius*, yet is intruth not the Epistle of *Vigilius*, but a very counterfeit and base forgery under his name, full of untruths, unworthy of any credit at all; which, besides other proofes, (hereafter to be alleaged) faineth *Mennas* to be Bishop of *Constantinople*, and to be excommunicated, together with *Theodorus*, by *Vigilius* foure or five yeares after hee was dead, which censure was to stand in force till *Mennas* repented of his contumacie against the Popes Decree, and should be reconciled to him. This lying and base forgery doth *Baronius* bring to prove *Theodorus*, and not *Iustinian* to bee the author of this *Imperiall Edict*. Might not one say here as was said of the Asse, Like lips, like lettuce? Such a writing is a most fit witnesse for *Baronius*, who delighteth in untruths, and not finding true records, to give testimony to them, it was fit hee should applaud the most vile and abject forgeries, if they seeme to speak ought pleasing to the Cardinals pallate, or which may serve to support his untruths.

9. You see that yet it appeares not that *Theodorus* was the writer or penner of this Decree, none of *Baronius* his witnesses affirming it, and *Liberatus*, who is the best of them all, affirming the contrary. I might now with this answer put off a great part of those reviling speeches which *Baronius* so prodigally bestoweth on *Theodorus*: But I minde not so to leave the Cardinall, nor suffer the proud Philistine so insolently to revile and insult over any one of the Israelites; much lesse this worthy Bishop of Cesarea, to whom hee could not have done a greater honor, than in that which he intended as an exceeding disgrace to him, to call and account him the Author and Writer of this *Edict*. It is no small honour, that *Iustinian*, so wise and religious an Emperour, should commit the care of so waighty a matter to *Theodorus*; that hee should have him in so high esteeme, as account his word an Oracle, to bee guided and directed by his judgement; so to adhere unto him, as *Constantine* did to that renowned *Hosius*, as to thinke it a *piaculum*, or great offence not to follow his advice in matters of so great waight, consequence, and importance. Nay, this one *Edict*, (supposing with the Cardinall *Theodorus* to bee the Author of it) shall not onely pleade for *Theodorus*, but utterly wipe away all those vile slanders of heresie, impiety, imprudency, and the like, so often, and so odiously objected, and exaggerated by the Cardinall against him; this writing and the words thereof being (as whosoever readeth them will easily conceive, and if hee deale ingenuously, confesse) the words of truth, of faith, of sobriety, of profound knowledge, evidences of a minde full fraught with faith, with piety, with the love of

of God, and Gods Church, and in a word full of the holy Ghoſt. As *Sophocles* [k], being accuſed to doate, recited his *Oedipus Coloneus*, and demanding whether that did ſeeme the Poeme of a doating man, was by the ſentence of all the Iudges acquitted: So none can reade this *Edict*, but forthwith acknowledge it a meere calumny in *Baronius* to call the maker of it an heretike, whoſe profeſſion of faith is ſo pious, divine, and Catholike. Or rather *Theodorus* may anſwer that *Baronian* ſlander with the like words, as did S. *Paul* [l], *They neither found me making an uproare among the people, nor in the Synagogues, nor in the City, neither can they prove theſe things whereof they now accuſe mee*; but this I confeſſe, that after this way, (declared in this *Edict*) which they call hereſie, ſo worſhip I the God of my fathers.

[k] *Cic. de Senect.*

[l] *Act. 24. 12. 13*

10. Now as this may ſerve for a generall Antidote at once, as it were, to expell all the whole poyſon of thoſe Baronian calumnies; ſo, if we ſhall deſcend to particulars, the innocency of *Theodorus*, as alſo the malice and malignity of *Baronius* will much more clearly appeare. The crimes objected to *Theodorus* by *Baronius* are reduced to three heads; one, his threefold hereſie; another, his oppoſing himſelfe to Pope *Vigilius*, or the Decree of Taciturnity, in the cauſe of the *Three Chapters*; the third, his miſleading of *Iuſtinian* into the hereſie of the Aphthardokites, and ſo cauſing that great perſecution of the Church which thereupon enſued; all the other diſgracefull termes are but the ſuperfluity of that malice which the Cardinall beares againſt all that were oppoſite to *Vigilius*, and his *Apoſtolicall* Conſtitution. To begin then with that which is eaſieſt, the two laſt crimes are not ſo eaſily uttered as refuted, they both are nothing elſe but meere ſlanders and calumnies, without any certaine ground, or probability of truth, deviſed either by *Baronius* himſelfe, or by ſuch as he is, enemies and haters of the truth; and truly for the later, his miſleading *Iuſtinian* into the hereſie of the Apthardokites, that is not onely a manifeſt untruth, (for *Iuſtinian*, as wee have before [m] proved, did not onely at all hold that hereſie) but it is wholly forged and deviſed by *Baronius*, he hath not any one Author, no not ſo much as a forged writing to teſtifie this, no nor any probable collection out of any Author to induce him to lay this imputation upon *Theodorus*; the world is wholly and ſoly beholden to the Cardinall for this ſhameleſſe calumny; and yet ſee the wiſedome of *Baronius* herein, hee was not content barely and in a word to taxe and reprove *Theodorus*, (which had beene more than ſufficient, having no proofe nor evidence of the crime) but in this paſſage, as if hee had demonſtratively proved *Theodorus* to bee guilty hereof, hee rageth and foameth like a wilde Bore againſt him, calling him a moſt wicked man, and moſt vehement propugner of blaſphemy, the plague of the whole Church, who with a viſor affrayed the Emperour like a little Boy from the truth, and led him captive into hereſie. Doe you not thinke that the Cardinall needed to be ſent to *Anticyra*, when he writ this not onely without truth, but without braine and ordinary ſenſe?

[m] *Ca. 20.*

11. The other crime, that *Theodorus* oppoſed himſelfe to *Vigilius*, and to the decree of ſilence, is like the former, ſave that this difference

rence is to be obſerved betwixt them, that the former was forged by *Baronius*, but this later is grounded on a fooliſh and forged writing applauded by *Baronius*, fictions and forgeries they are both, but the one was fained to the Cardinals hand, for the other hee was faine to beate it out of his owne anvill. There was neither any ſuch decree for taciturnity, neither did *Theodorus*, nor needed hee to oppoſe himſelfe to *Vigilius*, for *Vigilius*, as well as *Theodorus*, all the whole time almoſt from his comming to *Conſtantinople* till the fift Councell was aſſembled, wholly conſented to condemne the *Three Chapters*, as, beſides other evident proofes before alleaged, to which I remit the reader, that one teſtimony of the Emperour doth undeniably demonſtrate; *Quod* [n] *vero ejuſdem voluntatis ſemper fuit de condemnatione Trium Capitulorum per plurima declaravit; Vigilius hath by very many things declared, that he hath been alwayes* (ſince his comming to *Conſtantinople*) *of the ſame minde in condemning the Three Chapters*; what thinke you here againe of *Baronius*, who upon this occaſion of contradicting *Vigilius*, & his decree of ſilence, reviles *Theodorus*, *calling* [o] *him ſacrilegious, a Pſeudo-Biſhop, a tyrant, a ſchiſmatike, a perverter of lawes, the author of all evils*; and yet when the Cardinall hath ſaid all this, there is no truth nor reality in the cauſe and occaſion for which hee thus rageth and revileth; no oppoſition to *Vigilius*, no decree of ſilence either oppugned, or ſuch as might bee oppugned, it was a *non ens*, a chymera floating in the Cardinals idle fancy. Was there no Helleborus at Rome or in Italy to purge the Cardinals braine of this extreme diſtemper?

n *Epiſt. Iuſtin. ad Conc. 5. Act. 1 pa. 520. a.*

o *Loci ſupra citati.*

12. The whole hope conſiſts now in the Cardinals *Triarij*, the three hereſies objected to *Theodorus*, that of *Origen*, of *Eutyches*, and of the Aphthardokites. And for the two laſt I muſt ſay the ſame almoſt as to the former calumnies, they are meere fictions of *Baronius*: *Theodorus was* (ſaith hee [p]) *an Aphthardokite, and an Eutychean heretike*: what Author, what witneſſe or teſtimony doth the Cardinall produce to prove ſo hainous a crime againſt him? truly not one, himſelfe *accuſator ſimul & teſtis, is both the accuſer and the witneſſe*. But yet hee proves it by ſome good conſequence or reaſon? no nor that neither, his proofe is no leſſe fooliſh than his poſition is falſe. *Iuſtinian*, ſaith [q] he, *was miſled into the hereſie of the Aphthardokites by ſome Origeniſts, as Euſtathius declareth; whereupon we may eaſily, and without calumny affirme, that the ring-leader of thoſe who miſled the Emperour was Theodorus Biſh. of Cæſarea, an Origeniſt*: The ground of w^ch^, (to omit that this *Euſtathius* is of no credit) being the hereſie of *Iuſtinian*, ſeeing that to bee a calumnie and ſlander wee have before [r] confirmed, this whole collection muſt needs be like the foundation on which it relyeth, ſlanderous, and falſe, to ſay nothing how alogicall and incoherent a conſequent this is from particulars. Some Origeniſts miſled *Iuſtinian*, therefore *Theodorus*; how much rather on the contrary may wee certainly conclude, that ſeeing *Iuſtinian*, who was directed in cauſes of faith by *Theodorus*, continued orthodoxall, and a moſt worthy defender of the true faith, as before we proved, therefore doubtleſſe *Theodorus* himſelfe, the director of the Emperor, was, and remained orthodoxall;

p *Iuſtinianus obligatus fuit in eo errore (Aphthardokitarum) ab eis, qui ei aſſiſtebant, hereſis ejus defenſoribus. At quinam illi? Horum Anteſignanus fuit Theodorus ille nequiſſimus, &c. erat is Eutycheanæ blaſphemiæ propugnator. Baron. an. 564. nu. 6. & 7.*

q *Ibid.*

r *Sup. ca. 20.*

doxall, and that of a certaine hee was no Eutychean nor Aphthardokite, is evident by his ſubſcribing [r] to the decree of the fift Councell, wherein not onely the Councell, and decree of *Chalcedon* condemning *Eutyches*, and in it the hereſie of the Aphthardokites, is ſtrongly confirmed, but *Eutyches* alſo by name, and all that hold his hereſies, are anathematized, by all the Biſhops of that fift Councell, and particularly by this *Theodorus*, whom the Cardinall, without any teſtimony or proofe at all, ſlanders to have beene an Eutychean and Apthardokite, unto both which hereſies he was moſt oppoſite: All which will be more manifeſt by conſidering the firſt of thoſe three hereſies, wherein *Baronius* hath the greateſt colour for his ſaying. That *Theodorus* was an Origeniſt, and a moſt earneſt maintainer of that hereſie, the Cardinall often, and moſt confidently affirmeth; wherein hee hath *Liberatus* [t] the Deacon, and Biſhop *Facundus* [u] for his Authors.

[r] *Coll. 8.*

[t] *An. 538. nu. 29*
[u] *An. 546. 8, 9. & 49.*

13. Firſt for *Facundus*, he doth not expreſly mention *Theodorus* as an Origeniſt, but yet becauſe *Baronius* citeth him to ſay, that *Theodorus* writ the *Edict*, and *Facundus* calleth the writers of that *Edict*, Origeniſts, let him be admitted for one of the Cardinals witneſſes. Who I pray you, or of what credit thinke you is this Biſhop *Facundus*? Truly an enemy to *Iuſtinian*, an enemy to *Theodorus* of *Cæſarea*, and to all that condemned the *Three Chapters*, a very heretike, and enemy to the Catholike truth. Witneſſe hereof that teſtimony which their owne *Poſſevine* [x] giveth of him out of *Iſidorus*. He writ twelve bookes in defence of the *three Chapters*, whereby he proveth the condemning of thoſe *three Chapters* to bee the condemning or baniſhing of the Apoſtolike faith, and the Councell of *Chalcedon*. Now the defenders of the *three Chapters*, and writers in defence of them to bee condemned, anathematized, and accurſed for heretikes by the fift Councell, and after it the *6. 7.* and in a word, by all, both generall Councels, and Popes that follow *Gregory*, we have often before declared: So that by the conſenting judgement of all thoſe generall approved Councels, and Popes, *Facundus* being an earneſt defender of them, and writer in their defence, is anathematized, and condemned for an heretike. And that he continued pertinaciouſly in this hereſie, after the ſentence and judgement of the generall Councell, *Baronius* doth witneſſe, who [y] tels us, and that with a *Conſtat, It is certaine and manifeſt, that Facundus was ſought for to be puniſhed, becauſe hee had written moſt eloquently in defence of the three Chapters, but by lurking in ſome ſecret place he eſcaped. Poſſevine* [a] further addeth, that *Facundus* writ a booke againſt *Mutianus* in defence of *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia*, and that *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia, damnatus fuit ab Eccleſia Catholica ob errores contra fidem, was condemned by the Catholike Church, for his hereſie or errors againſt the faith.* Muſt not he needs bee an heretike, that defends a condemned heretike? yea defends thoſe very writings and errors of him and *Ibas*, which are condemned for hereticall? *I confeſſe*, ſaith *Facundus* [b], *to your Holineſſe, that I withdraw my ſelfe from the communion of the oppoſites*, (thoſe were the condemners of the *three Chapters*, that is, to ſay in truth, Catholikes) *not becauſe they condemne Theodorus of Mopſveſtia, but for that*

[x] *Poſſ. Appar. in verbo Facundus, et verbo Secundus.*

[y] *An. 553. nu. 221.*

[a] *In Facundo.*

[b] *Fac. apud Bar. an. 547. nu. 38.*

in the perſon of this Theodorus they condemne the Epiſtle of Ibas as hereticall, and by that Epiſtle condemne the Councell of Chalcedon, à qua ſuſcepta eſt, by which that Epiſtle is approved. Thus *Facundus;* ſo very heretically, that *Neſtorius, Eutyches, Dioſcorus*, nor any cõdemned heretike could wiſh or ſay more than *Facundus* hath done both for their hereſies, & againſt the Councell of *Chalcedon*. For the impious Epiſtle of *Ibas* is wholly hereticall, the approving of it is the overthrow of the whole Catholike faith: and yet *Facundus* not onely himſelfe defendeth that impious *Epiſtle* as orthodoxall, and by it defendeth the perſon and writing of *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia* a condemned heretike; but avoucheth the Councell of *Chalcedon* to approve the ſame, which condemnes it and every part of it even to the loweſt pit of hell.

14. Here by the way I muſt in a word put the reader in minde of one or two points which concern *Poſſevine* and *Baronius* in this paſſage. If *Facundus* be a condemned heretike for writing in defence of the *three Chapters*, what elſe can *Poſſevine* be who prayſed thoſe bookes of a condemned heretike? for thus he writeth [c], *Facundus* writ *opus grande atque elegans, a great and elegant worke*, containing twelve books, fortified by the authorities of the Fathers in defence of the *three Chapters*. Heretike! Is that a brave and elegant booke that defendeth hereſie? can hereſie be fortified by the teſtimonies of the holy Fathers? What is this elſe but to make the holy Fathers heretikes? So hereticall and ſpitefull is *Poſſevine*, that together with himſelfe he would draw the ancient and holy Fathers into one and the ſame crime of hereſie. The other point concernes *Baronius*: hee ſayth [d] that the controverſie or contention about the *three Chapters*, was *inter Catholicos tantum, onely among ſuch as were Catholikes:* doth not he plainly thereby ſignifie his opinion of *Facundus*, that he was a Catholike? for *Facundus* was as hot, and earneſt a contender in that controverſie as *Vigilius* himſelfe; he writ in defence of the *three Chapters* twelve whole bookes, elegant and brave bookes, as *Poſſevine* ſaith: he bitterly inveighed againſt the Emperour, againſt all the condemners of them, againſt Pope *Vigilius* himſelfe, when hee after his comming to *Conſtantinople* conſented to the Emperor. Seeing this *Facundus* (a convicted and condemned hehetike) is one of the Cardinals Catholikes, muſt not hereſie and Neſtorianiſme bee with him Catholike doctrine? muſt not the impious *Epiſtle* be orthodoxall, and the overthrow of the faith and decree of the Councell at *Chalcedon* bee an Article of *Baronius* faith? even that which he accounted the Catholike faith? But this by the way. We ſee now what manner of Biſhop *Facundus* was, an obſtinate heretike, pertinaciouſly perſiſting in hereſie. What though *Facundus* call *Theodorus* of *Cæſarea* an Origeniſt? Did not the old Neſtorians call *Cyrill*, and other Catholikes, Apollinarians? of whom it ſeemes the defenders of the *three Chapters* learned to calumniate the Catholikes with the names of heretikes and Origeniſts, when they were in truth wholly oppoſite to thoſe and other hereſies. Can any expect a true teſtimony concerning *Theodorus* Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, from *Facundus*, concerning Catholikes, from heretikes, their immortall and malicious enemies, nor theirs onely, but enemies to the truth? Such, and of ſuch

[c] *Loco citato.*

[d] *An. 547. nu. 30*

ſmall

ſmall worth is the former witneſs of *Baronius* in this cauſe, and againſt *Theodorus*.

15. His other witneſſe is *Liberatus* the Deacon, who indeed ſayth as [e] plainly as *Baronius* that *Theodorus* was an Origeniſt; and refers the occaſion of that whole controverſie touching the *three Chapters* to the malice of the ſame *Theodorus*. For as *Liberatus* ſaith, *Pelagius the Popes Legate when he was at Conſtantinople, entreated of the Emperour that Origen, and his hereſies wherewith the Eaſterne Churches, ſpecially about Ieruſalem, were exceedingly troubled, might be condemned; whereunto the Emperour willingly aſſenting, publiſhed an Imperiall Edict both againſt him and his errors: when Theodorus being an Origeniſt perceived that Origen who was long before dead was now condemned, he to be quit with Pelagius for procuring the condemnation of Origen, moved the Emperour alſo to condemne Theodorus Biſhop of Mopſveſtia, who had written much againſt Origen, whoſe writings were deteſted of all the Origeniſts: the Emperour at Theodorus his ſuggeſtion made another Edict, wherein he condemned Theodorus of Mopſveſtia, and the two other Chapters touching the writings of Theodoret and Ibas, which bred ſo long trouble in the Church.* Thus *Liberatus*. Who as you ſee ſpeaketh as much, and as eagerly againſt *Theodorus*, as *Baronius* could wiſh, and *Liberatus* lived and writ about that ſame time.

[e] *In Brev. ca. 24*

16. *Liberatus* in many things is to be allowed, in thoſe eſpecially wherein by partiality his judgement was not corrupt. But in this cauſe of the *Three Chapters*, in the occaſion and circumſtances thereof, hee is a moſt unfit witneſſe, himſelfe was deepely interreſſed in this cauſe, partiality blinded him, his ſtile was ſharpe againſt the adverſe part, but dull in taxing any, though never ſo great a crime, in men of his owne faction. Of him *Binius* [f] gives this true cenſure, *hee was one of their ranke who defended the Three Chapters*, who alſo writ an Apology for *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia*: againe, *Baronius* and *Bellarmine* have noted [g], that divers things are *caute legenda* in *Liberatus*; of him *Poſſevine* [h] writeth, *There are many things in Liberatus which are to bee read with circumſpection, thoſe eſpecially which hee borrowed of ſome Neſtorians, and thoſe are his narrations touching Theodorus of Mopſveſtia*, that his writings were praiſed both by the Emperour *Theodoſius* his *Edict*, and by *Cyrill*, and approved alſo in the Councell of *Chalcedon*; all which to be lies *Baronius* doth convince. Againe [i], what *Liberatus* ſaith of *the fift Councell is very warily to be read, for either they were not his own, or he was deceived by the falſe relation of ſome other, but certainly they do not agree with the writings of other Catholike fathers*. Thus *Poſſevine* out of *Baronius*; who might as well in plaine termes have called *Liberatus* a Neſtorian heretike, for none but Neſtorians, and ſuch as ſlander the Councel of *Chalcedon* for hereticall, can judge the writings of *Theodorus*, *wch* are ful of all hereſies, blaſphemies, and impieties, to be approved in that holy Councell. Againe, *Poſſevine* rejecting that *wch* *Liberatus* writeth of the fift Councell, gives a moſt juſt exception againſt all that he writeth either touching *Theodorus* of *Ceſarea*, as being an Origeniſt, or of the occaſiõ of this cõtroverſie about the 3. *Chapters*, as if it did ariſe from the cõdemning of *Origen*, in all this *Liberatus* by the Ieſuites confeſſion was deceived by the falſe relation of others, they a-

[f] *Fa notis ſuis in Brev. Liber. to 2. Conc. pa. 626.*

[g] *Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 5. § Caſa Bell. et Baronius in Liberati brevi rio, hæc cautè legenda admonuerũt.*

Binius loco citato.

[h] *In Appar. in verbo Liberatus.*

[i] *Ibid.*

gree not to the truth, nor to the narrations of Catholike fathers. *Liberatus* being an earneſt favourer and defender of *Theodorus Mopſveſtenus*, could not chuſe but hate *Theodorus* of *Ceſarea*, for ſeeking to have him and his writings condemned: The ſaying of *Ierome* [k] ought here to take place, *Profeſſæ inimicitiæ ſuſpitionem habent mendacij; the report of a profeſſed enemy ought to be ſuſpected as a lye.* The true cauſe why *Liberatus* is ſo violent againſt *Theodorus* of *Ceſarea*, was not for that *Theodorus* was an Origeniſt, (as *Liberatus*, and out of him *Baronius* ſlandereth him) but becauſe this *Theodorus* condemned the writings of *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia* whom *Liberatus* defended, and the two other Chapters. Neither was the condemning of *Origen* the occaſion of condemning the *three Chapters*, as *Liberatus* untruly reporteth, but as both *Iuſtinian* and the whole Councell witneſſe; the true occaſion thereof were the Neſtorian heretikes, who pretending and boaſting the *three Chapters* to bee allowed in the Councell of *Chalcedon*, both the Catholikes, in defence of the Councell, juſtly denyed the ſame, and the Emperour firſt, then the Councell to confirme the faith, condemned the *three Chapters*, which were the overthrow of the faith, as before [l] wee have proved.

k *Apol. 1. contra Ruffin. ad Pammach. et Marcel. pa. 304.*

l *Ca. 1 ſupra.*

17. This were enough to oppoſe to all that *Facundus* and *Liberatus* ſay, two defenders of the *three Chapters*, and ſo profeſſed enemies both to the Catholike truth defined in the fift Councell, and to *Theodorus* of *Ceſarea*, who firſt of all ſuggeſted the condemning of them to the Emperour *Iuſtinian*: But now, beſides this juſt exception againſt the Cardinals witneſſes I will adde two cleare and authentike proofes to demonſtrate both *Liberatus*, and after him *Baronius* unjuſtly and falſly to ſlander *Theodorus* of *Ceſarea* for an Origeniſt. The former is his owne ſubſcription to the fift Councell. In that Councel, among other heretikes, *Origen* is not only expreſly & by name condēned, & that in their definitive ſentence; but an Anathema alſo denounced againſt all who doe not condemne and anathematize him: theſe are the words of the Councell, [m] *If any doe not anathematize Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinarius; Neſtorius, Eutyches, Origen*, with their impious writings, *talis anathema ſit, ſuch an one let him bee accurſed.* To this Synodall decree did all the 165. Biſhops in the Councell conſent and ſubſcribe; the eighth man was this *Theodorus* of *Ceſarea*, who ſubſcribed [n] in this manner, *I Theodorus, decrevi quæ propoſita ſunt, have decreed theſe things which are propoſed, and I confeſſe that the truth is as all thoſe Chapters and doctrines above named* (of which this againſt *Origen* is the eleaventh) *doe containe*: when *Theodorus* himſelfe confeſſeth *Origen* and his writings to bee condemned, accurſeth them, yea, and all who doe not accurſe them, is it not a vile and unexcuſable calumny in *Liberatus* and in *Baronius*, to revile him as a patron of *Origen*?

m *Coll. 8. pa. 587 a. b.*

n *Coll. eadem pa. 588. b.*

18. Perhaps you will ſay hee was in former time an Origeniſt, but at the time of the fift Councell hee was become a new man. Though this were admitted, yet cannot *Baronius* bee excuſed, for calling him after that fift Councell an heretike, an Origeniſt: But hee was ſtill the ſame man, both now and before orthodoxall, as by the other evidence,

dence, taken from the *Emperours Edict* in condemning *Origen*, will appeare, when the defenders of *Origen*, both for their number, and inſolency, grew very troubleſome in the Eaſt, ſpecially about *Ieruſalem*. *Pelagius* and *Mennas*, as *Liberatus* [o] ſaith, at the inſtigation of ſome religious Monks, intreated the Emperour that *Origen* and his hereſies might be condemned: the Emperour thereupon publiſhed a very large and religious *Edict* againſt *Origen*, which he directed to *Mennas*, and the copy therof he ſent alſo to *Vigilius*, and to other Patriarks; after many other things the Emp. thus writeth [p], *We, deſiring to put away all offence from the holy Church, & to leave it without blemiſh, following the divine Scriptures, & holy fathers, who have caſt out and juſtly anathematized Origen and his impious doctrine, have ſent this our Epiſtle unto you, wherein we exhorte you, that you call an aſſembly or Synod of all the holy Biſhops and Abbots who are now in Conſtantinople, and that you ſee that all of them doe in writing anathematize Origen, and his wicked doctrines, and all the Chapters out of him under-written; and further that you ſend the Copy of what you have done in this cauſe (to all other Biſhops and Abbots within your Patriarkſhip) that they alſo may all doe the like.* Beſides this, the Emperour yet commands, *that none be ordained Biſhop or choſen into any Monaſtery, unleſſe forthwith in a booke they accurſe and anathematize, as Arius, Sabellus, Neſtorius, Eutyches, and the reſt, ſo alſo Origen and his impious doctrines.* Thus writ the Emperour, and what in this manner hee commanded *Mennas* to doe in his Patriarkſhip, the like was *Vigilius* to doe in the Romane, *Zoilus* in the Alexandrian, *Euphrenius* in the Antiochian. That, according as the Emperour commanded, this was done, *Liberatus* [q] is witneſſe; *ſo that by all the Biſhops in the world that then were, and by ſuch as were after this to bee ordained, Origen with his impious doctrines was to bee condemned and accurſed.* Particularly of the Synod or Biſhops at *Conſtantinople* *Baronius* [r] confeſſeth, *The Emperour admoniſhed Mennas to aſſemble a Synod, by which all theſe things which he had written againſt Origen might bee confirmed, quod & factum fuit, which was accordingly done*; and, as *Cedrenus* [ſ] ſaith, their ſentence was this, *We condemne all theſe errours of Origen, & omnes qui ita ſentiunt, & ſentient, and all who do either now or hereafter ſhall think as he doth*, condemning themſelves with an anathema, if either then they did thinke ſo, or ever hereafter ſhould think the like. That *Theodorus*, though he had remained at *Ceſarea* ſubſcribed to this ſentence, I thinke none can doubt, the Emperours command being ſo ſtrict to all Patriarks: But indeed it ſeemeth that *Theodorus* was not onely at *Conſtantinople* at this time, and there ſubſcribed, but that hee was one of the chiefe agents with the Emperour to publiſh this Edict; for of him *Evagrius* [t] witneſſeth, that, *cum Iuſtiniano aſſiduè verſabatur, he was continually converſant with the Emperour*, hee was faithfull, and eſpecially neceſſary unto him, of him *Liberatus* [u] ſaith, that hee was, *dilectus & familiaris Principum, deare and familiar both with the Emperour and Empreſſe*; of him [x] *Baronius* teſtifieth that he was *prapotens armiger Iuſtiniani, the Champion of Iuſtinian*, for ſo ſaith he, I may well call him that was uſed to ſit at the Emperours Elbow, yea, of whom [y] the Emperour had conceived ſo great an opinion, that hee thought it the chiefe point of his duty or piety,

o *Loco citato.*

p *Edictum Iuſtin. contra Origenem. extat to. 2. Con. fa. 482.*

q *Dictata eſt in Originem damnatio, quam ſubſcribentes, &c. Liber. ca. 23.*

r *An. 538. nu. 83*

ſ *Ced. in compend. Annal.*

t *Lib. 4. ca. 37.*

u *Ca. 24.*

x *An. 451. nu. 4*

y *An. 564. nu. 7.*

ejus ſemper inhærere Veſtigijs, alwayes to tread in the footſteps of Theodorus. Thus *Baronius*. Seeing *Theodorus* was ſo neare unto, ſo potent with the Emperour, ſo highly eſteemed by him, that hee alwayes trode in his ſteps, how could *Theodorus* bee a patron of *Origen*, when the Emperour himſelfe accurſed, and commanded all others to accurſe him? Did not *Theodorus* treade out this path of an anathema unto the Emperour? or had he been an Origeniſt, how could the Emperour, following him ſtep by ſtep, be an enemy to *Origen?* Or to omit many other like conſequences, ſeeing the Synod of *Conſtantinople*, (as, beſides *Baronius*, *Liberatus* witneſſeth) that is, all the Biſhops there preſent (among whom *Theodorus* being neare and deare unto the Emperour, and ſo continually converſant with him, was doubtleſſe one, and one of the chiefe) condemned *Origen*, it is not to bee doubted but that he was one of the firſt and chiefe Biſhops that ſubſcribed in that Synod to the condemnation of him. Now this was done in the 12.[z] yeare of *Iuſtinian*, that is, full fourteene yeares before the fift Councell, ſo ancient, ſo conſtant was the deteſtation of *Theodorus* towards *Origen*.

[z] *Hoc tempore (12. is annus Juſtin.) Conſtantinopoli magnum agitatum eſt de Origene judicium. Bar. an. 538. nu. 31. et Conc. 5. habitum an. 27. Iuſtin.*

19. Will any now judge otherwiſe of *Baronius* than a malicious ſlanderer? who raileth againſt *Theodorus* as the moſt earneſt Patron of *Origen*, whom his owne publike and conſtant profeſſion and ſubſcription teſtifieth to have accurſed *Origen* with all his hereſies; yea, to have accurſed all that doe either defend him, or think as *Origen* did, though outwardly and openly he doe not defend him, for that was one Article, * to which *Theodorus*, and the whole Synod under *Mennas* ſubſcribed; a curſe be to *Origen* with all his execrable doctrine, a curſe bee to every one who thinketh the ſame which he did, or who at any time doth preſume to defend the ſame.

* *Edict. Iuſt. cõtra Originem in fine.*

20. What are the partiall, uncertaine, and malicious reports of *Facundus*, of *Liberatus*, or of the Surian *Cyrill* (to adde him alſo among them) to theſe undoubted and authentike records of Councels? when wee reade and ſee the evident ſubſcription of *Theodorus* proclaming him to condemne and accurſe *Origen*, what vanitie, malice and hatred of truth is this in the Cardinall, to alleage two, or if you pleaſe, three partiall teſtimonies againſt that evidence which condemneth them, and all that they can ſay? So unfortunate is the Cardinall in all that he undertakes in this cauſe, that hee doth not onely ſpeake *præter*, but *contra*, directly contrary to the truth, whereof, as in other paſſages, ſo in this touching *Theodorus*, wee have ſeene ſo faire and cleare evidences.

Cap. XXIIII.

How unjuſtly Baronius *excepteth againſt the* Acts of the fift Councell, as being corrupted, and of no credit; *and a refutation in generall of the ſame.*

1. *Baronius* perceiving right well, that all which heretofore hath beene ſaid either againſt the Emperour, or the Empreſſe, or the Edict, or *Theodorus* the ſuppoſed author of it, is not ſufficient in any meaſure either to defend, or excuſe *Vigilius*; in the next place he taketh a very uncouth & unuſuall, but a moſt ſure courſe, whereby hee may not onely weaken, but utterly overthrow all that hath or can be ſaid againſt the Pope in this cauſe; for the *Acts* of the fift generall Councell being the moſt authentike records that can bee produced, to prove *Vigilius* and all that defend him, to bee heretikes; the Cardinall, and after him *Binius* will now no longer hacke at this or that perſon; which were agents in the cauſe, and but petty branches, but now hee will ſtrike at the very roote, calling into queſtion the Acts and evidences themſelves, ſtriving to prove them to bee of no credit; which if hee can doe, all the reſt, whatſoever can bee ſaid, will moſt eaſily bee rejected. Now becauſe *Baronius* was willing in this paſſage to ſhew not onely the utmoſt ſubtilty of his wit, but his exact diligence in picking out every quarrell, that art or malice could ſuggeſt againſt the Acts of this holy Councell, I muſt intreate the reader not to thinke it tedious (though unto mee this was a matter almoſt of greateſt trouble and difficultie) to heare patiently, and weigh with equity of judgement the manifold exceptions againſt theſe Acts, which he hath collected, or rather ſcattered upon every occaſion which offered it ſelfe here and there, that by his inculcating, and ingeminating of the accuſation he might breed ſome opinion of the truth thereof.

2. And before I enter into examination of the particulars, let me put the reader in minde of one or two conſiderations which may in generall concerne them all. The firſt is, that though the Cardinall, and *Binius* following him, have ſpared no labour to ſift theſe Acts as diligently as Satan did Saint *Peter*, and have objected ten or twelve ſpeciall corruptions in them, yet not any thing which they mention, or againſt which they except, doth any way ſo touch or concerne the cauſe of the *Three Chapters*, whereof wee have intreated, as either to ſhew that the Councell condemneth them not, or that *Vigilius* defendeth them not by his definitive & *Apoſtolical Conſtitutiõ*, or that the Councell by their Synodall ſentence and conſenting judgement did not for that cauſe condemne, anathematize, and accurſe for heretikes all that defend them, and ſo Pope *Vigilius*, among the reſt, and al that defend him or his *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution*. All theſe are matters of ſo certaine, evident, and undoubted truth, by the Acts, that *Baronius* or

Binius could finde nothing at all to blemish or darken them. So then, though the Acts were admitted in 100. or 1000. other points to bee corrupted, mutilated, and altered, yet the Cardinall and *Binius* are never a whit the nearer; the maine point at which they aime, is to excuse *Vigilius*, and those that defend him, but notwithstãding all that they have said, (and they have said all that industry, having borrowed serpentine eyes, could finde out) both *Vigilius* himselfe, and all who defend him, and those are all who defend the Popes *infallibility in defining causes of faith*, that is, all Papists, remaine still, as convicted, accursed, and anathematized heretikes, and that by the judgment of an holy generall Councell, approved by all succeeding, both Popes and Councels, till the time of *Luther* and *Leo* the tenth.

3. The second thing which I observe is, that corruptions which happely may bee crept into some Synodall Acts, or other writings, whether by mutilations, additions, or alterations, are no just cause to reject, as unworthy of credit, all the Acts of that Councell, or writings of the author. Admit this once, what credit can be given to the Nicene and Constantinopolitane Councels? whose Acts to bee miserably maimed, none is ignorant? yea, even the very Canons also to bee corrupted *Bellarmine* [a] and *Baronius* [b] doe professe and prove: The like corruption *Baronius* noteth in the first Ephesine Councell, wherein is set [c] downe, among other acts, *decretum Regum*, for the banishment of the Nestorians, of which *Baronius* [d] saith, *plura simul mendacia insuta habent, there are many lyes sowed up in these Acts.* In like sort in the Councell of *Chalcedon* is inserted among the Acts of the third Session [e], an Edict of the Emperor *Valentinianus* and *Martianus*, which was written a long [f] yeare after the Councell was ended, and therefore must of necessity be acknowledged to bee foisted, and unjustly inserted into the Acts. Of the sixt Councell *Bellarmine* [g] saith, that it without doubt is corrupted, and what soever is found there of *Honorius*, is falsly inserted. Of it *Binius* [h] after *Baronius* [i] saith, the Acts of it, are in many places depraved; and whatsoever is there reported to be said or done by *Honorius*, all that is added by the Monotheliles. Of the seventh *Binius* [k] thus writeth, This fourth Action is in divers places faulty, and in the History of the Image crucified at *Beritus* it containeth divers Apocryphall narrations concerning the Image of Christ made by *Nicodemus*. Of the eighth Councell, that the Canons thereof are corrupted, and some inserted by *Anastasius*, their owne *Raderus* [l] will perswade them. Let the Baronian reason against the Acts of this fift Councell bee applyed to these: He having found among these, one Epistle of *Theodorets* which hee supposeth to bee a counterfait, concludeth upon that one example in this manner, *quam fidem rogo merentur acta hujusmodi, quæ sunt his contexta commentis; what credit, I pray you, doe such Acts as these of the fift Councell deserve, which are intangled in such fictions?* May not the selfe same reason be much more justly alleaged against the Nicene and Constantinopolitane Canons; against the Acts of the Councell at *Ephesus*, at *Chalcedon*; against the sixt, seventh and eighth Synods, in every one of which, some, & in divers, more corruptions, not onely mutilations, but alterations,

a Prodatur Canones illos (Nicenos) non esse integros. Lib. 2. de Pontif. Rom. ca. 25. §. Omissa

b Quod Canon 6. Con. Nic. mutilatus sit, &c. Bar. an. 325. nu. 125. & Canon iste (5. Concilij Constantinopolitani) suspectus, imo planè addititius esse atque suppositus habetur, &c. Bar. an. 381 nn. 35.

c Tom. 5. Conc. Epheſ. ca. 11.

d An. 481. nu. 173.

e Pag. 84. b.

f Concilium finitum est mense Novemb. in Cõs. Martiani et Adelphij. Bar. an. 451. nu. 160. Edictum vero scriptum 7 Kalen. Febr. Coss. Sporatio.

g Bell. lib. 4. de Pontif. Rom. ca. 11. § Ad secundum depravata sunt. Bin. not. in Con. 6. § Acta.

h Acta Concilij multis in locis

i Bar. an. 681. nn. 13.

k Not. in Conc. Nicen. 2. et Acti. 4.

l Viginti septem Canones ex Anastasij codice sumptos nullus dubitet, et bi duo Canones non nisi ex Anastasio videntur accipi. Rad. in Obser. ad Conc. 8. pa. 448.

tions, and commentitious writings are inserted by their owne confession? Let *Baronius* answer here his owne question, *Quam fidem rogo?* I pray you then, what credit may bee given to such Canons or Acts as are those of *Nice*, of *Constantinople*, of *Ephesus*, of *Chalcedon*, of the sixt, seventh, or eighth Councell? they all must by the Cardinals reason be rejected, as Canons and Acts of no worth, of no credit at all: Nor they onely, but all the workes of *Augustine*, of *Athanasius*, of *Ierome*, and almost all the holy Fathers: none of them all by this Baronian reason, deserve any credit, for among their writings are inserted many suppositious and factitious tracts, as the book *de variis Quæstionibus Scripturæ*, the Sermon of the Assumption of the blessed Virgin, and many moe [m] in *Athanasius*, the Epistle of *Augustine* to *Cyrill*, and *Cyrils* to *Austen*, the author [n] of which was not onely an Impostor, but an heretike; the booke *de Spiritu & litera*, the booke of questions of the old and new Testament, which is hereticall, and an heape of the like in *Austen*; the Commentaries on *Pauls* Epistles, which savour of Pelagianisme; the Epistle to *Demetrias* concerning virginity, and 100. like in [o] *Ierome*. *Quæ fides rogo?* what credit can bee given to these bookes or writings of *Austen*, *Athanasius*, *Ierome*, or the rest, in which are found so many fictitious, & heretical treatises, falsly ascribed unto them, mingled and inserted among their writings? Truly, I cannot devise what might move the great Card. to make such a collection, and reason; as from some corruptions crept into the bookes of fathers, or Acts of Councels, to inferre, that the whole Acts or writings are unworthy of any credit, but onely as *Iacke Cade* had a purpose to burne all authentick records and writings of law, that, as hee boasted, all the law might proceed from his own mouth; so the Cardinal intended to play a right *Iacke Cade* with all the ancient Councels and Fathers, that having utterly, though not abolished, yet disgraced, and made them all by this his reason and collection unworthy of any credit, his owne mouth might bee an Oracle to report without controulment all histories of ancient matters; and what his Cardinalship should please to say in any matter, or to set downe in his Annals, that all men should beleeve, as if the most authentick Records in the world had testified the same: How much better and more advisedly might the Cardinall have done, to have wished all corruptions to bee removed? whatsoever can be certainly proved in any Acts of Councels, or writings of Fathers to be added unto them, that to be quite cut off; whatsoever might bee found wanting, that to bee added; whatsoever to be altered or perverted, that to be amended, and not in the blindnesse of his hatred, against this one fist Councell, to fight like one of the *Andabatæ*, against al the rest, and with one stroke to cashire all the Acts and Canons of Councels, all the writings of Fathers or Historians, because, forsooth, one or some few corruptions have either by negligence or errour of writing, or by fraud and malice of some malignant hand crept into them.

[m] *Poss. Appar. in Athan. p. 127.*
[n] *Poss. in Aug. pa. 147.*
[o] *Poss. in Hier. pa. 751.*

4. The third thing which I observe, is, that whereas *Baronius* so often and so spightfully declameth against the Acts of this Councell, as imperfect and corrupted; this his whole accusation proceedeth of malice

lice to the Councell and theſe Acts; rather than of judgement or of truth; for I doe conſtantly affirme, and who ſo ever pleaſeth to peruſe the Councels ſhall certainly finde, (and, if he deale ingenuouſly, will confeſſe the ſame) that as of al the general Councels which go before this fift, for integrity of the Acts, none is better, or any way comparable to this, ſave that of *Chalcedon*: ſo of all that follow it none at all is to bee preferred, nor any way to bee counted equall with it, unleſſe that which they call the ſixt Councell, that is, ſo much of the Acts of that Synod as concerne the cauſe of the Monothelites, leaving out the *Trullane* Canons: This, whoſoever is exerciſed in the Volumes of Councels cannot chooſe but obſerve. The Nicene & Conſtantinopolitane being ſo miſerably maimed, that ſcarce wee have ſo much as a few ſhreds or chips of the moſt magnificent buildings of thoſe Councels, which, if they could bee recovered, no treaſures are ſufficient to redeeme a worke of that worth and value, a worke *non gemmis, neque purpura vænale, neque auro*. That of *Epheſus* is a little helped indeed by *Peltanus*, but yet it remaines ſo imperfect, ſo confuſed, and diſorderly, that as *Diogines* ſought men in the moſt thronged multitudes of men, ſo among thoſe very Acts & large Tomes of the Coũcels, the reader ſhall be forced to ſeeke the Acts of the *Epheſine* Councell. The Acts of the ſecond *Nicene*, and of the next to it, which they call the eighth, are ſo doubtfull, that not onely this or that part, but the whole fabrick of them both is queſtionable, whether they were the Synodall Acts, or but a relation framed by *Anaſtaſius*, as hee thought beſt. Of all the eight Councels, the Acts of *Chalcedon*, this fift, and the ſixt have beene moſt ſafely preſerved, and like the river *Arethuſa* have ſtrongly paſſed through ſo many corrupt ages and hands, and yet without tainture of the ſalt, deliver unto us the cleare and ſweete current of antiquity and truth: And verily, when I ſeriouſly compare the wrack of other Councels with the entireneſſe of theſe three, I cannot but admire and magnifie with all my might the gracious providence, wiſdome, and love of God to his Church, for in every one of theſe there is an unreſiſtable force of truth, againſt that Antichriſtiã authority & ſupremacy which is now made the *foundation* of the Popiſh faith; the ſixt in the cauſe of *Honorius*, the fift in this cauſe of *Vigilius*, and that of *Chalcedon*, in curbing the Popes Legates, in croſſing the decree, and knowne reſolution of Pope *Leo*, and in being a moſt lively patterne of that rightfull and ancient authority which Emperours then held above all the Biſhops in the Councell; but now the Pope uſurpes both above all Biſhops, Emperours and Councels. God would by theſe monuments of antiquity pull downe the lofty Towers, and raze from the very bottome that foundation of *Babylon*, w^ch^ can never be firme and ſetled; hee would have, beſides other particular witneſſes, theſe unconquerable and irreſiſtible forces of theſe ancient and generall Councels, againſt which no juſt exception can be taken: and although I will not excuſe the acts of theſe, nor any of them from all defects and blemiſhes whatſoever, yet I dare boldly averre, that they are ſo few, ſo light, and of ſo ſmall importance, that the maine controverſies handled in them, or relying on them, cannot be prejudicated thereby,

they

they being rather the errours of the Collectors, or of the writers, and exſcribers of theſe Councels, than of the Councels themſelves: And particularly for this fift Councell, againſt which *Baronius* doth ſo furiouſly declame: I doubt not to make it evident, that all the faults, which, after much prying, hee hath objected unto the Acts thereof, will prove ſo many evident teſtimonies of his owne moſt fraudulent and corrupt dealing, and not the defects or corruptions in the Acts of this Councell. But let us view the particulars.

CAP. XXV.

The firſt alteration *of the Synodall Acts pretended by* Baronius, for that the text of the Councell at *Chalcedon* is changed therein, *refuted.*

THE corruptions which *Baronius*, and out of him *Binius* objecteth, are according to the grammaticall diviſion reduced to three ſorts of irregularity: Some by variation or alteration, others by defect or mutilation, the reſt by redundance or addition. In the firſt ranke hee pretendeth three examples; the firſt which ſeemeth to be of greateſt moment, and carieth the greateſt colour of probability is the corrupting of a certaine text of the Councell at *Chalcedon* cited by this fift Synod. Heare the accuſation in *Baronius* his owne words, *We may not here omit*, ſaith he [a], *to note the craft of the Grecians, who, contrary to right and equitie, have corrupted the holy text of the Synodall Acts, by adding unto the Councell of Chalcedon thoſe words, about which there was much contention in the time of Pope Hormiſda, when certaine ſuſpected of Eutycheaniſme, ſpecially ſome Scythian Monkes, did labour that unto the holy Councell of Chalcedon theſe words might bee added, Dominum noſtrum Ieſum Chriſtum unum eſſe de ſancta Trinitate; which when they could not obtaine, becauſe the Synod was well enough without that addition, here now (in this fift Councell) where the Epiſtle of* Ibas *is compared with the profeſſion of the Councell at Chalcedon; they recite theſe words of the Synod* [*Chalcedonenſis ſancta Synodus in definitione quam de fide fecit, pradicat Deum verbum incarnatum eſſe hominem*] *the holy Synod of Chalcedon in the definition which it made of faith, doth profeſſe God the Word to have beene incarnate and made man*; and they adde unto the words of the Synod, [*qui eſt Dominus noſter Ieſus Chriſtus, unus de ſancta Trinitate; who is our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, one of the holy Trinitie*;] as if the Synod of *Chalcedon* had profeſſed that, whereas they rather would call Chriſt, *unam perſonam ſanctæ Trinitatis*, than *unum de ſancta Trinitate*. Thus *Baronius*: In which few words of his there are contained ſo many notable untruths, and hereticall frauds, that without a rare dexterity in that craft, hee could not have eaſily contrived and couched them in ſo ſmall a roome.

[a] *An.* 553. *nu.* 214.

2. Firſt,

2. First, that they who contended to have Christ called *unum de ſancta Trinitate*, were heretikes, or Eutycheans, or unjuſtly ſuſpected thereof, is not onely untrue, but bewrayes the Cardinals obſtinate and obdurate affection to Neſtorianiſme; for as *Dionyſius* [b] *Exiguus* in his Preface to the Epiſtle of *Proclus*, witneſſeth, and moſt truly, the diſciples of *Theodorus Mopſveſtenus* began to teach an impious faith to the people, with moſt crafty ſubtilty profeſſing the Trinity to bee in ſuch ſort of one Eſſence, *ut Chriſtum Dominum noſtrum unum ex Trinitate nullatenus faterentur, that they would by no meanes confeſſe Chriſt our Lord to be one of the Trinity*; and thereupon they taught a quaternity in the perſons. If *Baronius* eſteeme it hereſie to profeſſe Chriſt, *unum de ſancta Trinitate*, then is hee certainly by this, beſides all other evidences, convicted to be a Neſtorian heretike, for it is an Article of their Neſtorian, and repugnant to the Catholike faith, to deny or doubt to call Chriſt, *unum de ſancta Trinitate*.

[b] *Extat in Bib. S. pat. tom. 3.*

3. Secondly, that the Councell of *Chalcedon* made ever any doubt to profeſſe Chriſt to bee *unum de ſancta Trinitate*, or that they would rather call him, *unam perſonam Trinitatis*, is another vile Neſtorian ſlander, and hereticall untruth of *Baronius*. The Councell of *Chalcedon*, ſaith *Iuſtinian* [c], *approved the Epiſtle of Proclus, wherin it is taught, that we ought to confeſſe our Lord Ieſus Chriſt to be one of the holy Trinity: Proclus*, ſaith [d] *Dionyſius Exiguus*, did marvellouſly reſiſt that impiety, and hee taught our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, *unum de Trinitate eſſe, to bee one of the Trinity*. When the Neſtorians troubled the Church about this matter, *Iuſtinian* ſet forth a moſt religious *Imperiall Edict* [e], wherein hee commanded all to profeſſe Chriſt to bee *unum de Trinitate*; wee anathematize, ſaith he, every hereſie, eſpecially *Neſtorius*, and thoſe who thinke, or have thought as he did; wee anathematize thoſe who deny or will not confeſſe our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, *unum eſſe ex ſancta & conſubſtantiali Trinitate, to bee one of the holy and conſubſtantiall Trinitie*. This Imperiall Edict the very next yeare after it was publiſhed was confirmed by Pope *Iohn*, who thus writeth [f] to the Emperour, *You for the love of the faith, and to remove hereſie, have publiſhed an Edict, which, becauſe it agreeth with the Apoſtolike doctrine, wee confirme by our authority*: and againe, *You have writ and publiſhed thoſe things, which both the Apoſtolike doctrine, and the venerable authority of the holy Fathers hath decreed, & nos in omnibus confirmamus, and we confirme it in all points: This your faith is the true and certaine religion, this all the Fathers & Biſhops of Rome, and the Apoſtolike See hath hitherto inviolably kept; this confeſſion whoſoever doth contradict, hee is an alien from the holy Communion, and from the Catholike Church*. Thus Pope *Iohn*. What can any man in the world now thinke elſe of *Baronius*, but condemne him for an accurſed heretike? Hee denyes the Councell of *Chalcedon* to embrace that profeſſion, *unum de Trinitate*, which, as the Emperour and Pope witneſſe, it earneſtly embraceth; he not onely ſuſpecteth in this place, but in plaine termes elſe-where [g], *he calleth the Scythian Monks Eutycheans, heretikes, and oppugners of the Councell of Chalcedon*, and that for this cauſe, for that both themſelves profeſſed, and required others to profeſſe Chriſt to bee *unum de ſancta Trinitate*; nor content here-

[c] *Leg. 7. de ſumma Trinit. ca. 4.*

[d] *Loco citato.*

[e] *Edict. extat apud Bar. an. 533. nu. 7. 9.*

[f] *Epiſt. 1. Iob. 2. ad Juſtin. to. 2. Conc. pa. 404. et Bar. an. 534. nu. 15. et ſeq.*

[g] *Planè competitur eoſdem ipſos (Scythiæ Monachos) Eutycheanos fuiſſe hæreticos. Bar. an. 519. nu. 99.*

herewith hee addeth theſe words, the hereſie whereof with no niter can bee waſht away: hee faineth, ſaith *Baronius* [h], that theſe words, *unus de Trinitate eſt crucifixus*, are to bee added for the ſtrengthning and explaning of the Councell of *Chalcedon*; which ſentence (*unus de Trinitate eſt crucifixus*) the Legates of the Apoſtolike Sea, *prorſus reijcendam eſſe putarunt, thought to bee ſuch as ought utterly to be rejected*, as being never uſed by the Fathers in their Synodall ſentences; *latere enim ſcirebant ſub melle venenum, for they knew that poiſon did lye under this hony.* Now ſeeing by *Iuſtinians Edict*, and the Popes confirmation thereof, all, who either refuſe, or who will not profeſſe Chriſt to be *unum de ſancta Trinitate*, are accurſed, and excluded from the Catholike Church and communion; *Baronius* cannot poſſibly eſcape that juſt cenſure, who condemneth that profeſſion as hereticall, and as repugnant to the faith of *Chalcedon*. Thus while the Cardinall labours to prove by this the Acts of the fift Councell to bee corrupt, hee demonſtrates himſelfe to bee both untrue, hereticall, rejected out of the Church, and a ſlanderer of the holy Councell of *Chalcedon*, as favouring the hereſie of *Neſtorius*.

h *An. cod. nu.* 102.

4. Thirdly, whereas hee ſaith, that the Scythian Monkes would *inferre verba iſta in Synodum Chalcedonenſem*, bring or thruſt in thoſe words into the Councell of *Chalcedon*, it is a ſlander without all colour or ground of truth: they ſaw divers Neſtorians obſtinate in denying this truth, that Chriſt was *unus de ſancta Trinitate*, who pretended for them that theſe words were not expreſſed in the Councell of *Chalcedon*; the Monkes and Catholikes moſt juſtly replyed, that though the expreſſe words were not there, yet the ſenſe of them was decreed in that Councell, that this confeſſion was but an expreſſion or explication of that which was truly, implicitely, and more obſcurely decreed at *Chalcedon*. To falſifie the Acts of that Councell, or adde one ſyllable unto it, otherwiſe than by way of explanation or declaration, that, the Monks and Catholikes, whom *Baronius* calleth Eutycheans, never ſought to doe, as at large appeares by that moſt learned and orthodoxall booke written by *Iohannes Maxentius* about this very cauſe, againſt which booke, and the Author thereof, the more earneſtly *Baronius* doth oppoſe himſelfe, and call them hereticall, hee doth not therby one whit diſgrace them (his tongue and pen is no ſlander, at leaſt not to weighed) but the more he ſtill intangles himſelfe in the hereſie of the Neſtorians, out of which in that cauſe none can extricate him, as in another Treatiſe I purpoſe God willing, to demonſtrate.

5. Fourthly, whereas *Baronius* ſaith, that the Scythian Monkes prevailed not in the dayes of *Hormiſda*, *quod abſque additamento Synodus rectè conſiſteret*, becauſe the Synod of *Chalcedon* was well enough without that addition, hee ſhewes a notable ſleight of his hereticall fraud. That the Synod is well enough without adding thoſe words, as an expreſſe part of the Synodall decree, or as written *totidem verbis* by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, is moſt true, but nothing to the purpoſe; for neither the Scythian Monks nor any Catholikes did affirme them ſo to bee, or wiſh them ſo to bee added, for that had beene to

ſay

ſay in expreſſe words, wee will have the decree falſified, or written in other words than it was by the Councell: But that the Synod was well enough without this additament, as an explication of it, and declaration of the ſenſe of that Councell, is moſt untrue; for both *Iuſtinian* by his Edict commanded, and Pope *Iohn* by his *Apoſtolike* authoritie confirmed, that to bee the true meaning, both of that Councell, and of all the holy Fathers: And when a controverſie is once moved, and on foote, whether Chriſt ought to bee called *unus de ſancta Trinitate*, for a man then to deny this, or deny it to bee decreed in the Councell of *Chalcedon*, or to deny that it ought to be added as a true explanation of that Councell, is to deny the whole Catholike faith, and the decrees of the foure firſt Councels; and though one ſhall ſay and profeſſe in words, as did *Hormiſda* and his Legates, that they hold the whole Councell of *Chalcedon*, yet in that they expreſly deny this truth, which was certainly decreed at *Chalcedon*, their generall profeſſion ſhall not excuſe them, but their expreſſe deniall of this one particular ſhall demonſtrate them, both to bee heretikes, and expreſly to beleeve and hold an hereſie repugnant to that Councell, which in a generality they profeſſe to hold, but indeed and truth doe not. Even as the expreſſe denying of the manhood, or Godhead of Chriſt, or reſurrection of the dead ſhall convince one to bee an heretike, though hee profeſſe himſelfe in a generality to beleeve and hold all that the holy Scriptures doe teach, or the Nicene fathers decree. If *Baronius* his words, that the Councell is right without that additament, bee taken in the former ſenſe, they are idle, vaine, and ſpoken to no purpoſe, which, of the Cardinals deepe wiſedome is not to bee imagined: If they bee taken (as I ſuppoſe they are) in the later ſenſe, they undeniably demonſtrate him to bee a Cardinall Neſtorian.

6. But leaving all the reſt of the Cardinals frauds in this paſſage, let us come to that laſt clauſe which concernes the corrupting of the Councell of *Chalcedon*. This, ſaith he, which in *Hormiſdaes* dayes they could not, now in this fift Synod they obtained, now they added to the words of the Synod this clauſe, *qui eſt Dominus unus de ſancta Trinitate*: A very perilous corruption ſure, to expreſſe that clauſe which all the Biſhops of *Rome*, (*ſemper excipio Hormiſdam*) with all Catholikes, beleeved and taught, which, whoſoever denieth or wil not profeſſe, is anathematized, and excluded from the Catholike Church. Is not this thinke you a very ſore corruption of the Councell of *Chalcedon?* Is not the Cardinall a rare man of judgement that could ſpie ſuch a maine fault in theſe Acts of the fift Councell, that they profeſſe Chriſt to be *unum de ſancta Trinitate*; to which profeſſion both they and all other were bound under the cenſure of an anathema.

7. Yea, but in the Acts thoſe words are cited as the words of the Councell of *Chalcedon*; whoſe they are not. A meere fancy and calumny of the Cardinall: they are plainly ſet downe as the words of the fift Synod, whoſe indeed they are; and it relateth not preciſely the words of the Councell of *Chalcedon*, nor what it there expreſſed, *totidem verbis*, but the true ſumme and ſubſtance of what is there decreed.

creed. For thus they say[i], *The holy Synod of Chalcedon in the definition which it made of faith, doth professe God the Word incarnate, to be made man*; this is all they report of the Councell of *Chalcedon*, as by the opposition of *Ibas* his *Epistle* is apparent, wherein they oppose not that he denyed Christ to be one of the Trinity, but that hee called them heretikes who taught the Word incarnate to be made man. That clause which they adde [That Christ is one of the Trinity] is an addition of the fift Councell it selfe, explicating that of Christ, which the *Emperours Edict* bound them to professe, as being the true sense and meaning of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, but not as being word for word set downe in the decree of *Chalcedon*. And even as he were more than ridiculous, who would accuse one to corrupt the Councell of *Chalcedon* for saying they professed Christ to be God and man, who was borne in *Bethleem*, and fled from *Herod* into Ægypt; so is the Cardinall as ridiculous in objecting this as a corruption of the Synod, or addition to the Councell of *Chalcedon*, that they say the Councell taught the Word of God to bee man, who is our Lord Iesus Christ, one of the holy Trinity. Both additions are true, but neither of them affirmed to be expresly, and *totidem verbis*, set downe in the Councell of *Chalcedon*. Why but looke to the Cardinals proofe, for he would not for any good affirme such a matter without proofe. What? doe yee aske for proofe of the Cardinall? I tell you, it is proofe enough that he sayth it: and truly in this poynt he produceth neither any proofe, nor any shadow of reason to prove either that those words are falsely inserted into the Acts of the fift Councell, or that the fift Councell cited them as the very expresse words of the Councell of *Chalcedon*: all the proofe is grounded on his old Topicke place *Ipse dixit*, which is a sory kind of arguing, against any that love the truth: for although against the Pope or their popish cause, any thing which he writeth is a very strong evidence against them, seeing the Cardinall is very circumspect & wary to let nothing, no not a syllable fall from him which may in the least wise seem to prejudice the Popes dignity, or the cause of their Church, unlesse the maine force and undeniable evidence of truth doe wrest and wring it from his pen: yet in any matter of history, wherein he may advantage the Pope, or benefit their cause, it is not by many degrees so good to say, the *illustrissimus Cardinalis* affirmes it, which is now growne a familiar kinde of proofe among them[k], as to say, *Ovid*, *Æsop*, or *Iacobus Voraginensis* affirme it, therefore it is certainly true. His Annals in the art of fraudulent, vile, and pernicious untruths farre excell the most base fictitious Poemes or Legends that ever as yet have seene the Sunne.

i *Coll. 6. pa. 575. a.*

k *Vide Gretz. tralatus varios, & alios ejus farinæ.*

Cap. XXVI.

The ſecond alteration *of the Synodall Acts pretended by* Baronius, for that *Ibas* is ſayd therein to have denyed the Epiſtle written to *Maris* to be his, *refuted.*



1. He ſecond thing which our *Momus* [a] carpeth at, is for that in theſe Acts it is ſayd that *Ibas* denyed the *Epiſtle* written to *Maris*, to bee his: which ſaith *Baronius* is untrue; for *Ibas* profeſſed the *Epiſtle* to be his. And *Binius* not content to call it with the Cardinall an untruth, in plaine termes affirmes [b] it to be a lye. Had not hatred to the truth corrupted or quite blinded the judgement of *Baronius* and *Binius*, they would never have quarelled with the Acts about this matter, nor for this accuſed them to have beene corrupt. They may as well collect the Edict of *Iuſtinian*, or that famous Epiſtle of Pope *Gregorie*, wherein he writeth of *Ibas* and the *three Chapters*, to be corrupted, and of no credit, as well as the Acts of the fift Councell: for in both [c] them the ſame is ſaid concerning the deniall of *Ibas* which is in theſe Acts. If notwithſtanding the avouching of that denyall, they may paſſe for ſincere and incorrupt, it was certainly malice and not reaſon that moved the Cardinall and *Binius* to carpe at the Acts for this cauſe: which will much more appeare, if any pleaſe but to view the Acts themſelves. For this is not ſpoken *obiter*, nor once, but the Councell inſiſteth upon it, repeateth it in ſeverall [d] places, and divers times; and if thoſe words were taken away, there would be an apparent *hiatus* in the text of thoſe Acts. The words then are truly the words of the true Acts, the corruption is onely in the braine of *Baronius* and *Binius*.

2. Now whereas the Cardinall and *Binius* ſo confidently affirme this to be untrue, or a lye, that *Ibas* denyed his Epiſtle, and ſo accuſe the whole Councell to lye in this matter, they doe but keepe their owne tongues and pens in ure with calumnies: the untruth and lye belongs neither to the Councell, nor to the Acts, but muſt bee returned to themſelves to whom onely it is due. For the Councels truth herein, the Emperour is a moſt honourable witneſſe, who ſaith [e], *Demonſtratur Ibas eam abnegaſſe, Ibas is demonſtrated*, or by evident prooſe knowne, *to have denyed his Epiſtle*. Pope *Gregory* is another witneſſe above exception, who ſaith [f], *Epiſtolam Ibas denegat ſuam, Ibas denyed the Epiſtle to be his*: the fift Councell alſo doth not onely affirme it, but prove [g] it by the teſtimony of ſix Metropolitan Biſhops, and their interloquution in the Councell of *Chalcedon*, they all ſayd they received *Ibas*, *eo quod negabat illa, becauſe he did deny thoſe things which were objected by his adverſaries*: a great part of which was that *Epiſtle*. All theſe are witneſſes for the Councell: what witneſſes now doth the Cardinall or *Binius* bring to countervaile theſe? truly not ſo much as one:

a *Dum falſa quædam ibi (in Actis 5. Concily) aſſerta reperiuntur, de impoſtura non mediocrem ſuſpicionem inducunt: cum viz. ibi dictum habetur, Ibam negaſſe Epiſtolã eſſe ſuam. Bar. an. 553. nu. 211*

b *Duo aut plura mendacia de Ibæ epiſtola leguntur. Bin. Notis in Conc. 5. pa. 604.*

b. Acta Conc. 5. nõ uno loco indicant quod Ibas Epiſtolam non agnoverit, verũ hæc ſententia, &c. ibid. p. 607. a

c *Ibas non eſt auſus eam ſuam dicere Epiſtolam Iuſtin. edictum pa. 496. b. Epiſtolam Ibas denegat ſuam. Greg. lib. 7. Epiſt. 53.*

d *Abnegans Epiſtolam. Coll. 6. pa. 563. b. Eo quod abnegabat Ibas illa. Coll. eadem. pa. 564. a. Vnde & Ibas eam abnegabat. ibid. & alibi.*

e *Loco nuper citato.*

f *Loco citato.*

g *Coll. 6. p. 564. a Johannes Sebaſtiæ, Seleucus Amaſiæ, Conſtantinus, Patritius, Petrus & Athanaſius, omnes Metropolitani pariter interloquuti ſunt, eo quod Ibas abnegavit illa, &c.*

one: and one were but a poore number to be oppoſed to ſo many, and ſo worthy men, teſtifying the contrary. Now whether the teſtimony of the Emperour, Pope *Gregory*, of ſix Metropolitanes, and an whole generall approved Councell affirming this; or *Baronius* without any one witneſſe denying this, be more credible, let the very beſt friends of *Baronius* judge: but *Baronius* loves to bee *Iohannes ad oppoſitum*, to Emperours, Popes, Biſhops, and Councels: if they ſay any thing that pleaſeth not his palate, that is indeed, if they ſay the truth.

3. But yet *Baronius* hath a proofe of his ſaying, which is this; becauſe *Ibas* [h] confeſſed it to be his, and hee tels us this is in the Acts of *Chalcedon*. Say he did confeſſe it, as I will not deny that he did; (though I verily thinke the Cardinall ſpeakes an untruth, in ſaying that this is in the Acts, for I finde not in thoſe Acts either any ſuch expreſſe confeſſion, or ought from whence it can be collected: and *Iuſtinian* plainly ſaith [i], *that Ibas durſt not acknowledge it to be his*, for the blaſphemies contained therein,) but I admit that *Ibas* confeſſed it to be his. Doth it thence follow, that he denyed it not to be his? might he not doe both? might he not contradict himſelfe? doth not the Cardinall, (who neither for wit nor wiſedome will yeeld one jote to *Ibas*,) doth not he as much in this very cauſe of *Ibas Epiſtle*: In one place he [k] ſayth, the Epiſtle being produced, *non eſſe Ibæ compertam, it was found not to be the Epiſtle of Ibas*, as the Acts of *Chalcedon* doe ſhew: in another [l] place he ſaith the quite contrary: *The true Acts of Chalcedon have it, that Ibas confeſſed it to be his Epiſtle*. Is not this a peece of handſome worke of the Cardinall? The Epiſtle is his, the Epiſtle is not his: the Acts of *Chalcedon* ſay it is his; the Acts of *Chalcedon* ſay it is not his. Could *Vertumnus* himſelfe play more cunningly fa.. and looſe than he doth? Might not *Ibas* doe the like? ſometimes for his owne credit deny the Epiſtle to be his, though at other times he confeſſed it to be his? Is it not more likely in it ſelfe, more charity in others to thinke that *Ibas* did thus, than that the Emperour, Pope *Gregory*, and a generall Councell did all conſpire to tell a lye.

h *Acta Germana habent Ibam confeſſum, eam eſſe ſuam: ſed & acta Conc. Chalc. eandem Epiſtolam ut Ibæ cognitam eſſe docent. Bar. an. 448. nu. 77.*

i *Loco citat.*

k *Bar an. 432. nu. 71.*

l *Bar. 448. nu. 77*

4. And not to diſpute that (which we have now admitted) whether he confeſſed it to be his or not; that he did certainly deny it to be his Epiſtle, if neither the fift generall Councell, nor *Iuſtinian*, nor *Gregory* had teſtified this, yet the Acts of the Councell of *Chalcedon* where *Ibas* himſelfe was perſonally preſent, have ſo cleare a demonſtration thereof, that I cannot ſufficiently admire either the ſtupidity, or the moſt ſhameleſſe dealing of *Baronius* and *Binius*, who with their foule mouthes call it an untruth, and a lye: for that Epiſtle was writ by *Ibas* not onely after the union made betwixt *Iohn* and *Cyrill*, as *Iuſtinian* [m], and the fift [n] Councell truly teach; but as wee have before clearly [o] proved, at leaſt two yeares after the ſame. In that Epiſtle *Cyrill* is called an heretike, an Apollinarian, as both the fift Councell teſtifieth, ſaying [p], *Epiſtola Cyrillum ſanctæ memoriæ hæreticum vocat*; and the very words of the Epiſtle doe make evident, wherein *Ibas* ſaith [q], *Cyrill is found to have falne into the doctrine of Apollinaris*: And againe, ſpeaking of theſe twelve Chapters of *Cyrill*, which both the *Epheſine* and *Chalcedon* Councell confirme, he calls [r] them *plena omni impietate*,

m *Epiſtola factæ oſtenditur poſt unitatem ad orientales facta. Edict. Iuſt. loco citato.*

n *Impia epiſtola poſt unitatem ſcripta oſtenditur. Conc. 5. coll. 6. pa. 563.*

o *Sup. ca. 10.*

p *Coll. 6. pa. 575. a.*

q *In Conc. Chalc. act. 10. pa. 113. d*

r *Ibid.*

impietate, full of all impiety, and contrary to the faith. Thus writ *Ibas* of *Cyrill* two yeares at leaſt after the union was fully made. Now in the Acts before *Photius* and *Euſtathius*, which are expreſſed in the Councell of *Chalcedon*, *Ibas* there profeſſed before the Iudges, that after the union once made, *we all*, ſayth he [f], *held communion with Cyrill*, we accounted him an orthodoxall Biſhop, *& nullus eum appellat hæreticum, and none after that called Cyrill an heretike:* was not this a plaine denyall that he writ this Epiſtle? for whoſoever writ it calleth *Cyrill* an heretike, and that divers yeares after the union: now *Ibas* denyeth that ever after the union he called *Cyrill* an heretike. Could he more directly conclude that he writ not this Epiſtle? unleſſe one will ſay that to deny *Baronius* to have written or publiſhed one word after the beginning of Pope *Sixtus* the fift, be not a certaine denyall, that the Annalls which goe under his name, and were all publiſhed after the beginning of *Sixtus* [t], are the Annalls of *Baronius*. This denyall by an evident and moſt certaine conſequent, (not any expreſſe denyall *totidem verbis*, as if *Ibas* had ſayd, this is not my Epiſtle) was it which both *Iuſtinian* and the fift Councell meant, as their owne words doe declare: *The Epiſtle*, ſayth *Iuſtinian* [u], *being full of blaſphemies*, and containing many injuries againſt S. *Cyrill*, is ſhewed to be written after the union, *ex quo demonſtratur Ibas eam abnegaſſe, whereby it is demonſtrated that Ibas denyed it*, (in that he ſayd, that he never called *Cyrill* an heretike after that union.) *The impious Epiſtle*, ſayth the Councell [x], *is ſhewed by the contents thereof to have beene written after the union*; therefore it appeareth that *Ibas* denyed it to be his Epiſtle by this, in that he ſayd that he ſpake nothing againſt *Cyrill* after the union: again, *Ibas* in this denyed the Epiſtle, *eò quod dicebat*, becauſe he ſayd [y], after the union I am not found to have ſayd ought againſt Saint *Cyrill*. Yea this and no other, to have beene that denyall which the Councell meant, *Baronius* knew right well; for himſelfe ſayth [z], that it is ſayd in the Councell, that *Ibas denyed the Epiſtle, ex eo, for this cauſe*, for that after the union and peace made, he denyed that he had ſayd ought againſt *Cyrill*: yet notwithſtanding all this evidence of truth, the Cardinall to diſgrace the Acts of this Councell, even againſt his owne knowledge and conſcience affirmeth it to bee an untruth, or as *Binius* calls it, (in a moſt ſpitefull manner) a lye, that *Ibas* denyed this Epiſtle to be his.

[f] *In Conc. Chalc. Act.* 10. *p.* 113. *a*

[t] *Nam primum eorum Tomum dedicavit Sixto* 5. *an.* 1589.

[u] *Loco citato.*

[x] *Loco citato.*

[y] *Coll.* 6. *p.* 564. *a*

[z] *an.* 553. *n.* 211

CAP. XXVII.

The third alteration *of the Synodall Acts pretended by* Baronius, for that the Councell of *Chalcedon* is ſaid therein to condemne the Epiſtle of *Ibas, refuted.*

1.  HE third corruption is by a miſ-report and untrue relation which *Baronius* obſerveth in theſe Acts, for that in them the Councel of *Chalcedon* is ſaid to have condemned that *Epiſtle* of *Ibas*, *which he not onely ſaith* [a] *is untrue*, (*Binius* cals [b] it alſo in plaine termes, a lye,) *but addeth both that the Acts of the Councell of Chalcedon doe teach the contrary, and that out of thoſe Acts hee hath before demonſtrated the ſame.* Call you this a corruption of the Acts? why, it is the maine purpoſe of the Councell, it is their very judgement and reſolution touching the *Three Chapters*, often and with acclamations repeated. The Epiſtle [c] is contrary to the definition, *Epiſtolam* [d] *definitio ſancti Chalcedonenſis Concilij condemnat, definitio ejecit*; in the proofe whereof they much inſiſt. Neither onely in the ſixt collation doe they at large ſet downe this, but in their eighth, even in their Synodall definition [e] they expreſly mention, that they have not onely ſaid, but even demonſtrated before, that this Epiſtle is in all things contrary to the definition of the Councell at *Chalcedon*; yea, they there adde, which is more, *that the Councel of Chalcedon would in no ſort otherwiſe* [f] *receive* Ibas, *unleſſe he himſelfe did condemne the impietie contained in that Epiſtle.* Would any in the world (ſave *Baronius*, a man meerly infatuated in this cauſe, and ſuch as follow his idle fancies) account that to bee a corruption or depravation of the Acts, which is the maine ſcope, purpoſe, judgement, and definition of the Synod? which they ſo often in their ſeverall Seſſions repeate, of which they expreſly teſtifie in their very definitive ſentence, that they before had ſaid, proved, & demonſtrated the ſame, without which alſo if it were taken away, (as the Cardinall pretends it ſhould,) not onely the Acts ſhould be utterly perverted, but the quite contrary to the judgement and determination of the Councell, ſhould bee affirmed. *Baronius* might with as great truth and probability have ſaid, that the handling of the *Three Chapters*, or judging of the *Three Chapters* had beene a depravation and corrupting of the Acts, for this aſſertion that *Ibas* his Epiſtle was condemned by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, is as neceſſarie and eſſentiall to the Acts, as the cauſe it ſelfe of the *Three Chapters*, or any ſentence that is any where ſet downe therein.

2. But yet if it be no depravation in the Acts, yet, ſaith the Cardinall, [g] and *Binius*, it is untrue, It is a lye, that the Councell of *Chalcedon* condemned that Epiſtle: Let falſhood and impudency it ſelfe ſtand here amazed and agaſt at theſe men. This definitive ſentence of

a *Quod Ibidem ſubditur, eandem Epiſtolam in Synodo Chalced. fuiſſe damnatam, ipſa acta ſecus docent, neutrum enim horum verum eſſe ſuperius demonſtravimus.* Bar. an. 553. num. 211.

b *Duo aut plura mendacia.* Bin. not. in Conc. 5. p. 606. b.

c *Anathematizavit Epiſt. contrariam per omnia, expoſitæ definitioni à Concilio Chalc. Sancta Synodus dixit. Scimus et nos hæc ita ſubſequuti eſſe.* Coll. 6 pa. 564. a.

d Coll. eadem. pa. 576. b.

e *Quo facto demonſtratum eſt, contrariam per omnia Epiſtolam eſſe his quæ definitione (Chalc.) continentur.* Coll. 8. pa. 584. a.

f *Invenimus quæ non aliter paſſi ſunt Ibam ſuſcipere, &c.* Ib.

g Loc. citat.

this Councell, wherein it is proclamed and decreed, that the *Epiſtle* of *Ibas* was condemned by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, is approved by all ſucceeding generall Councells, by *Pelagius*, *Gregory*, and all other their ſucceſſors, till *Leo* the tenth, (that is, by the conſenting judgment of the whole Catholike Church, and of all Catholikes ever ſince that decree was made) and now *Baronius* and *Binius* ſtand up to give them all the lie; they all ſay untruths, onely *Baronius* and *Binius* are men that drop Oracles, out of whoſe mouths no lie nor untruth can at any time proceed.

h *Loco cit.*

3. But ſaith the Cardinall [h], *The Acts of the Councell of Chalcedon doe declare this, and out of them I have before demonſtrated this.* Loe, the Cardinall will not onely ſay it, but prove it, yea, he hath even demonſtrated out of the Councell of *Chalcedon* all the former Popes, and Councels, that is, all the whole Catholike Church, to lye. I feare mee, ſuch demonſtrations will not turne to the Cardinals credit: Doe the Acts of the Councell teach or demonſtrate that? could none of the Popes? none of the ſucceeding generall Councels ſpie it in thoſe Acts, till *Baronius* took thē all tardy in an untruth? What wil you ſay to the Cardinal and to his demonſtration, if the Acts doe not teach this? nay, if they teach directly and demonſtrate the quite contrary, who then, I pray you, muſt have the whetſtone? the Catholike Church or the illuſtrious Cardinall? And certainly the Acts of *Chalcedon* doe demonſtrate what this fift Councell, and after it the ſixt, ſeventh, and eighth, and the reſt teſtifie, that this *Epiſtle* of *Ibas* was condemned by the Councell of *Chalcedon*. Firſt, it is cleare and certaine by thoſe Acts that the Councell of *Chalcedon* condemned *Neſtorius*, and all the impious doctrines and blaſphemies of *Neſtorius*, approving the *Epheſine* [i] Councell, and the Synodall Epiſtle of *Cyrill*, wherein they [k] are condemned and anathematized: was not this a condemning of the Epiſtle of *Ibas*, which defendeth *Neſtorius* and his hereſies, which is full fraught with all his blaſphemous doctrines? Could the Councell of *Chalcedon* condemne and anathematize the doctrine of *Neſtorius*, and yet not condemne that *Epiſtle* which defends all thoſe doctrines? By the Acts it is cleare and certaine, that the Councell of *Chalcedon* approve [l] their owne decree of faith: now this *Epiſtle*, as not onely the fift Councell often [m], but after it Pope *Gregory* ſaith, *procul dubio definitioni Synodi probatur adverſa, without doubt is contrary to the definition of the Councell of Chalcedon.* Is not the approving of their definition a rejecting and condemning of whatſoever writing is contrary to the ſame? By the Acts it is cleare and certaine, that the Councell even in their definition [o] forbids, and pronounceth it unlawfull for any to teach, or produce, or write, or deliuer any other doctrine; which whoſoever doth, if hee bee a Biſhop or Clerke, hee ſhall bee depoſed; if a Monke or Lay man, anathematized: Is not this a plaine forbidding of that Epiſtle to bee read, or taught, the doctrine whereof is directly contrary to their decree? when by the Councels decree it may neither be taught, written, nor read, (otherwiſe then with a deteſtation) is not this a condemning of it by the Councell? by the Acts that is cleare in the fift Councell [p], that the Councell of

Chalcedon

i *S. et magna Synodus S. Cyrilli Synodales Epiſtolas amplexa eſt, ad arguendū Neſtorianam dementiam, &c. Conc Chalc. Act. 5. pa. 96. et Can. 1 pa. 15.*

k *Omnes Epiſcopi clamaverunt, Quicunque Neſtoriano anathematizat, anathema ſit. Omnes Neſtorij Epiſtolam, et dogmata anathematizamus. Con. Epheſ. to. 2. ca. 4. pa. 743.*

l *Huic omnes cōſentimus; omnes ita ſapimus Act. 5. pa. 98.*

m *Epiſtolam definitio S. Chalcedonenſis Concilij condemnavit. Collat. 6. pa. 576 b. et alibi.*

n *Lib. 7. Ind. 2. Epiſt. 54.*

o *Chal. Conc. Act 5. pa. 38.*

p *Hoc judicium Photij et Euſtathij omnes Epiſcopi (Chal. Cōc.) ſequuti, perfecerunt ipſum (Ibam) anathematizare Neſtorium et impias ejus dogmata. Con. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 563. b.*

Chalcedon approved the judgement of *Photius* and *Euſtathius*, for as *Photius* and *Euſtathius*, ſo they all at [q] *Chalcedon* required *Ibas* to anathematize *Neſtorius* and his doctrines, before they would receive him. Now as the fift Councell [r] truly ſaith, to approve the judgement of *Photius* and *Euſtathius*, *Nihil eſt aliud quam condemnare impiam Epiſtolam; this is nothing elſe than to condemne the impious Epiſtle*, ſeeing in it *Neſtorius* and his hereſies are defended. To be ſhort (for there are very many other evidences to declare this,) Pope *Gregory* [s] teſtifieth, that the fift Councell was *in omnibus ſequax, did in all things follow the Councell of Chalcedon*; if in all, then in condemning this impious *Epiſtle*, and if they followed it therein, then moſt certainly the Councell of *Chalcedon* condemned it before them. So untrue it is which the Cardinall ſaith, that the Acts doe ſhew, and that out of them he hath demonſtrated, that the Councell of *Chalcedon* did not condemne this *Epiſtle*, whereas he hath demonſtrated nothing ſo cleare, as himſelfe to bee a malicious and ſhameleſſe downfacer of moſt certaine and evident truths. Thus much of his firſt ſort of *corruptions*, namely, the *three variations* or depravations, wherewith, as you ſee, hee hath ſlandered the Acts of this fift Councell, to his immortall diſgrace.

q *Ibam anathematizantem Neſtorium et ejus impia dogmata, permanere in Sacerdotio volo. Euſeb. Epiſt. Act. cyræ in Conc. Chal. Act. 10 pa. 115. ſic Stephanus, Romanus, Eunomius et omnes Epiſcopi clamaverunt; omnes eadē dicimus. Ibid. pa. 116. a.*

r *Coll. 6 p. 563. b*

s *Loco citato.*

Cap. XXVIII.

The three firſt defects *in the Synodall Acts, pretended by* Baronius, for that the Acts againſt the Origeniſts, the Edict of *Iuſtinian*, and his Epiſtle touching that cauſe, are wanting therein, *refuted.*

1. THE ſecond kinde of the Cardinals Heteroclites, are his *defectives* [a]: And here he and *Binius* labour to prove the lameneſſe and defects of theſe Acts by five inſtances: The firſt of them concernes the proceeding againſt *Origen*, and the Origeniſts, which was done in the fift Synod, but is now wanting in the Acts thereof. Let us firſt heare what *Binius* [b] ſaith hereof; *The curtaling and maime of theſe Acts doe thoſe fragments declare which we have added to the end of the Synod, quodque nulla vel levis tantum mentio reperiatur de condemnatis erroribus Origenis; and becauſe there is no mention, no not any ſmall, or light mention, found in them, touching the errours of Origen condemned.* If one were diſpoſed to quit *Binius* with his owne uncivill words, *Binius* ſhould here be proclamed both for a moſt impudent lyar, and a ſhameleſſe belyar of theſe Synodal acts, of this holy Councell. There is expreſſe mention of condemning *Origen* in the fift Collation, *Origen* [c] *was anathematized after his death in the time of Theophilus Biſhop of Alexandria, which alſo your ſanctitie*, (hee ſpeakes to the Biſhops of this Synod) *and Vigilius Pope of Rome have now done.* Again, there is expreſſe mention of him, and his errours in the eighth collation in the very Synodall and *definitive* ſentence of the Councel, wherein

a *Intelligas quā plurima in eādē 5. Synodo deſiderari. Bar. an. 553 nu. 243.*

b *Decurtationē et mutilationem Actorum indicant illa fragmenta quæ in fine hujus Synodi ſubjungi curavimus. Bin. not. in Conc. 5. § Conſtitutum.*

c *Coll. 5. pa. 553.*

in *Origen* and his impious writings are condemned; for thus it is writ-
c *Coll.* 8. *Anath.* 11. *pa.* 587. *a.* ten [c], *If any man doe not accurse Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinarius, Nestorius, Eutyches, Origen, cum impijs eorum conscriptis, with their impious writings, and all other heretikes condemned by the Catholike Church, let that man bee accursed.* When the holy Councell not onely mentions the condemning of *Origen*, but by their judiciall sentence themselves also condemne, both him, his errors, and his impious writings; what a face of Adamant had *Binius*, against the truth, against his owne text of the Councell, against his conscience and knowledge to say, there is no mention, no not any *levis mentio*, to be found in the Acts of the errors of *Origen* condemned? or if *Binius* will not be perswaded of his untruth, for us, let him acknowledge it for his Master
d *An.* 553. *nu.* 248. *Baronius* his credit, who saith [d], *In these Synodall Acts there is made onely, brevis mentio de Origine ejusque erroribus condemnatis, a short mention in the eleventh anathematisme of Origen, and his errours condemned*: if there bee *brevis mentio* of him and his errours, then *Binius* must cry the Acts forgiveneſſe, for saying there is no mention at all, no not *levis mentio*, of his errours.

e *An.* 553. *nu.* 238. 2. Let us see now if *Baronius* deale any better. *Constat*, saith [e] hee, *It is manifest by the testification of many, that Origen, Didimus, and Evagrius, together with their errours were condemned in this fift Synod, and that there was written, at least recited & repeated against them those ten Anathematisms which Nicephorus setteth downe; but in the Acts there is onely a briefe mention that Origen and his errours were condemned. Baronius* adds one speciall point further out of *Cedrenus*, that in this fift Councell,
f *An.* eod. *nu.* 242. *porro de Origine, actum esse in Synodo ponitur, inde vero de Theodoro. &c.* *first* [f], *they handled the cause against Origen, and then against the Three Chapters*: So by the Cardinals profession there wants the whole first action in these Acts of this Synod, which, it may be, had many Sessions, as the other Action about the *three Chapters*: Besides this, there wants also, saith hee [g], *the letters or Edict published by Iustinian*: Thirdly, there wants [h], *the Epistle of Iustinian*, sent to the Synod about the condemning of *Origen*, which is set downe by *Cedrenus*, out of whom both *Baronius* reciteth it, and *Binius* adjoyns it at the end of the Acts among the fragments which are wanting in these Acts. These *three defects* touching the cause of *Origen* doth the Cardinall alleage.

g *Ceterũ et illas putamus esse his (actis de Origine) subjectas literas imperatoris ad Menam Origenis errores continentes. Bar. an. eod.* 553. *nu.* 242.

3. But in very deed none of these three, nor ought else, which *Baronius* mentioneth, argue any defect at all in these Acts, but they evidently demonstrate in the Card.a maine defect of judgement, and an overflowing superabundance of malice against this holy Synod, and these true Acts thereof. That the cause of *Origen* was not, as hee supposeth, the first *Action*, or the first cause handled by the Synod; I might alleage the most cleare testimony of his [i] owne witnesse *Nicephorus*, who after the narration of the *three Chapters*, and the Synodall sentence touching them delivered, which he accounts for the first Session of the Synod, addeth [k], *In secunda autem Sessione, but in the second Sessiõ, the Libels against the impious doctrines of Origen were offred & read*, and *Iustinian, rursum Synodũ de eis sententiã ferre jussit, commanded againe the Synod to give sentence in that cause*. So *Nicephorus*: whereby it is evident that the Cardinal and his *Cedrenus* are foully deceived in saying,

h *Fuisse eandem Epistolam (quam Cedrenus recitat) ad Synodum datam actis ejus intextam, nemo jure dubitarit ut ex his intelligas quam plurima desiderari. Bar. an. eod. nu.* 243.

i *An. eod. nu.* 238.

k *Niceph. Callist. lib* 17. *Eccl. Histor. ca.* 27.

that

that the cauſe of *Origen* was firſt handled by the Synod, and after that the cauſe of the *three Chapters*: but I oppoſe to theſe, farre greater and even authentike records, the *Epiſtle* of the Emperour [l] to the Synod, who, at the beginning and firſt meeting of the Biſhops in the Councell, propoſed to their handling the cauſe of the *Three Chapters*, and no other at all; commanding them without delay to diſcuſſe and give their judgement in that: I oppoſe the *definition* and Synodall decree [m], wherein is ſet downe their whole proceeding, and what they handled almoſt every day of their meeting, from the beginning to the ending; ſo that it alone is as a Theſean thred, which wil not permit a man to erre in this cauſe, unleſſe he maliciouſly ſhut his eyes againſt the truth, and wilfully depart out of that plaine path. They [n] came to the Synod to decide the controverſie then moved about the *Three Chapters*, at the command of the Emperour; before they entred to the handling thereof, they often intreated by their meſſengers, Pope *Vigilius* to come together with them, (which was all that they did in the firſt [o] & ſecond [p] day of their meeting or Collation) when *Vigilius* would not come, then by the Apoſtles admonition, they prepared themſelves to the handling of the cauſe propoſed, by ſetting downe a confeſſion of their faith, conſonant to the foure former Councels, and expoſition of the Fathers, and promiſing in their next meeting to handle the cauſe of the *Three Chapters*, which was the ſumme of the third [q] dayes Collation: *Cumque* [r] *ita confeſſi ſimus, initium fecimus examinationis trium Capitulorum; and when wee had made this confeſſion, wee began the examination of the Three Chapters*; loe, they did *initium ſumere*, they began with this. Could they ſpeak more plainly, that the cauſe of *Origen* was not firſt handled? as if prophetically they meant to refute this untruth of *Baronius* and *Cedrenus*; and wee firſt diſcuſſed the cauſe of *Theodorus Mopſveſtenus* out of his owne writing there read before us: This was all they did the fourth [s], and a great part of the fift [t] day of their Collatiõ. *His de Theodoro diſcuſſis, pauca de Theodoreto; next after the diſcuſſing of the Chapter touching Theodorus, wee cauſed a few things to bee repeated out of the impious writings of Theodoret*; for the ſatisfying of the reader; and this they did in the end of the fift day or Collation. *Tertio loco Epiſtola quam Ibas, &c; In the third place we propoſed, and examined the Epiſtle of Ibas*: and this they did at large, and it was all they did in the ſixt [u] day of their Collation. The whole cauſe being thus, and, as the Councell confeſſeth, moſt diligently and ſufficiently examined, the Councell (as it ſeemeth by their owne words in the end of the ſixt Collation) intended to proceed to ſentence in the next day of their meeting: but before ought was done therein, the Emperour ſent unto the Synod certaine letters of *Vigilius*, teſtifying his condemning of thoſe *Three Chapters*, and ſome other writings, the reading of thē is all was done in the ſeventh [x] day of their Collation. Now for that the cauſe was ſufficiently examined before, and theſe letters were read onely for a further evidence, but not for neceſſity of the cauſe, and for that the Synod did nothing themſelves, but onely heard the letters, and applauded the Emperours zeale and care for the truth, therefore it is that this ſeventh Collation, and what was done

l *Extat Conc. 5. Coll. 1.*

m *Collat. 8.*

n *Pro Dei voluntate & juſſione piſſimi Imperatoris convenimus. Ibid.*

o 1. *Coll. 4. die Maij.*

p 2. *Coll. 8. die Maij.*

q 3. *Coll. 9. die Maij.*

r *Loc. cit. Coll. 8. pa. 584.*

s *Coll. 4. 12. die Maij.*

t *Coll. 5. 14 die Maij. pridiè Idus Maij. Bar. an. 553. nu. 41.*

u 6. *Coll. 19. Maij.*

x 7. *Coll. 26. die Maij.*

done therein is omitted in the Synodall ſentence, and the Councell which on that ſeventh day had made ready and intended to have pronounced their ſentence, by this occaſion deferred it to the next, which was the eighth [y] day of their Collation, uſing theſe for the laſt words of their ſeventh dayes meeting, *De tribus capitulis altero die adjuvante Deo Synodicam ſententiam proferemus*; *God willing wee will pronounce our Synodall ſentence touching this cauſe of the three Chapters the next day.* And ſo they did in that eighth, which was their laſt day of Collation. Thus not onely by *Nicephorus* and the Emperours *Epiſtle*, but by the evident teſtimony of the whole Synod in the ſynodall ſentence, it is undoubtedly certaine that the cauſe of *Origen* was not as he fancieth the firſt action or cauſe handled in the Synod, and that he doth but play the Mome in carping at the Acts for want of the firſt Action.

y 8. *Coll.* 5. *die huius.*

4. It may bee yet that the cauſe of *Origen* was the ſecond action in the fift Synod, as *Nicephorus* [z] ſaith, and after him *Evagrius* [*], and that is enough to prove the defects of theſe Acts. No, it was not the ſecond neither; as it was not before, ſo neither was it handled after the other of the *Three Chapters*, witneſſe the Synodall ſentence it ſelfe, wherein all the matters which every day they examined and diſcuſſed are ſet downe and repeated; after repetition they teſtifie [a] alſo, *Repetitis igitur omnibus, quæ apud nos acta ſunt, all things being repeated which were done or handled by way of diſcuſſion among us*, or in this Synod. Seeing they repeated all that was debated among them, and make no mention of this cauſe of *Origen*, it is undoubtedly certaine that *Origens* cauſe was not debated either firſt or laſt in the Synod; it was neither the firſt *action*, as *Cedrenus* and *Baronius*, nor the ſecond, as *Evagrius* and *Nicephorus* ſuppoſe; beſides the very determination of the Synod, evidently declares the errours of *Nicephorus* and *Evagrius*: *The books*, ſay they [b], *againſt the doctrine of Origen being offered to the Synod*, the Emperour demanded of the Councell, *Quid de his ſtatueret, What it would decree concerning thoſe doctrines?* A matter utterly incoherent and improbable; for in the ſynodall decree concerning the *three Chapters*, which they ſuppoſe to be made before this cauſe of *Origen* was either heard or propoſed, the Councell had expreſly delivered their judgement, and condemned both *Origen* and his impious writings. When they had already condemned both him and his errors, what an incongruity is it to make the Emperour demand, what they would decree of him and his errours? Or may we thinke that the holy Synod would firſt condemne *Origen*, and his impious writings as they did, in the ſynodall ſentence againſt the *three Chapters*, and then afterwards examin the matter, and make an enquiry whether *Origen* and his writings were to bee condemned or not? which were to follow that diſorder which the Switzers are reported to have uſed in judgement, (which was moſt juſtly called *Iudicium vetitum*) to execute a man, and then try and examine whether he ought to be executed or not. Farre be it from any to imagine ſuch injuſtice and raſhneſſe to have beene in this holy generall Councell. Seeing then they condemned and accurſed *Origen* and all his errours, in that which *Nicephorus* and *Evagrius* account the former Seſſion, it is ridiculous to think that either the Emperour

z *Loco citato.*
* *Evag. lib. 4. ca. 37.*

a *Coll. 8. p. 586. a*

b *Niceph. et Evag. loc. citat.*

perour urged, or that they themſelves would in the ſecond Seſſion goe Switzer-like to examine the bookes and doctrines of *Origen*, whether he & they ought to be condemned. Some doubt perhaps may ariſe out of thoſe words in the Councell [d], which the Cardinall ſlily [e] alledgeth, *Origen* was condemned in the time of *Theophilus*, *Quod etiam nunc in ipſa fecit veſtra Sanctitas*, *which your Holineſſe hath now done*, and Pope *Vigilius* alſo. But if the words be marked, they make nothing againſt that which I have ſaid: for neither hath that [*Nunc*] a relation to this preſent Councell, (for it is certaine that in it *Vigilius* did not condemne *Origen*, ſeeing he was not at all preſent in the Synod,) but to this age; he was condemned in former ages, as namely by *Theophilus*, and now alſo, that is, in this your age, and even by your ſelves, and by *Vigilius*: and if ought elſe were imported thereby, yet is it onely ſaid that *Origen* was now condemned: which was indeed done by the Synod: but that his cauſe was then examined and debated there, neither is it true, neither doe the words any way imply.

d *Coll.5.p.552.a*
e *An.553.nu.42 hæc acta inquit deſiderantur in Synodo, &c.*

5. Nay I adde further, not onely that this Councell did not debate this cauſe of *Origen*, but it had beene both ſuperfluous, and an open wrong to themſelves, and to the whole Church, to have entred into the examination thereof. For beſide many other former judgements, not many [e] yeares before in the time of *Mennas*, both the Emperour in an Imperiall *Edict* [f] had condemned *Origen* and his errors; and by the Emperours command, *Mennas* with a Synod of Biſhops then preſent at *Conſtantinople*, had confirmed that condemnation; the other Biſhops who were abſent did the like, the Emperour requiring every Patriarke to cauſe all the Biſhops ſubject to his juriſdiction, to ſubſcribe to the ſame. The doctrines and writings of *Origen* were no doubt at that time fully debated; all the Biſhops preſent in this fift Councell had then ſubſcribed and conſented to the condemnation of him and his errors; ſo had *Vigilius* and all Catholike Biſhops in the Weſt. Seeing the judgement of the Church in condemning *Origen* was univerſall, would the Councell, after themſelves, and all other Catholike Biſhops, that is, after the judgement of the whole Catholike Church, now debate and examine whether *Origen* and his doctrines ought to be condemned? They might as well call into queſtion whether *Arius*, or *Macedonius*, or *Neſtorius*, or *Eutyches*, and their doctrine ſhould bee condemned: the judgement of the Catholike Church was alike paſſed on them all: for this Councell [g] condemned and accurſed *Origen* and his errors, as it did *Arius*, *Macedonius*, *Neſtorius*, and *Eutyches*, but it condemned them all upon the knowne judgement of the Catholike Church, not upon a new tryall or examination then taken of any one of them. And this verily ſeemes to have deceived and led into error *Evagrius*, *Nicephorus*, and *Cedrenus*, (for of *Baronius* I cannot for many reaſons imagine it to have beene errour or ignorance in him, but wilfull and malicious oppugning the truth,) they knew or heard by report, (for even *Evagrius* [h], who lived in that age, ſaith of that which hee writeth touching the fift Synod, Of theſe things *ſic actum accepimus*, *we have heard they were thus done*,) I ſay, they might heare (that which indeed was true) that *Origen* and his errours were

e *Anno ineunte 12. Iuſtiniani, & Vigilii 2. ut notat Bar.an.538. nu.29.et 31.*
f *Extat Edict. to.2.Conc. pa. 482.et ſeq.*
g *Coll.8. pa.587*
h *Evag.loc.cit.*

were condemned in a Councell at *Conſtantinople* in the time of *Iuſtinian*; and they not being curious, nor carefull to ſift the diverſities of Councels, nor exact in computating times, confounded the former particular Synod under *Mennas*, wherein many of the doctrines of *Origen* were recited, and he with them condemned in eleven Anathematiſmes [i], with this fift generall Synod, held ſome fourteene years after, wherein *Origen* and his errours were alſo condemned, but neither the Emperours *Edict* read, nor the cauſe of *Origen* debated, nor the particulars recited as they were in the former. Further, it is moſt likely that together with divers copies of the fift Councell were annexed the Acts of that former under *Mennas*, that ſo men might ſee what were the particular hereſies condemned in *Origen*, wherein ſome according to the order of time might ſet them before theſe, and others according to the order of dignity might ſet them after the acts of this fift Councell; which might occaſion ſome with *Cedrenus* to thinke them a former, ſome with *Nicephorus* to thinke them a ſecond action of this fift Councell, whereas in truth they were the acts of a ſeverall and provinciall Councell by themſelves, and neither the firſt nor laſt, nor any acts at all of this generall Councell.

i *Extant poſt edictum Iuſtin. pa.488.*

6. By this now I ſuppoſe every one doth ſee the weakneſſe of the Baronian frame, touching the anathematiſmes and proceeding againſt *Origen*. They are not extant among the acts of the fift Synod. True: nor were they ever, nor ought they to bee inſerted or ſet among the true Acts thereof: theſe anathematiſmes neither were made nor repeated in the Councell. The Edict of *Iuſtinian* for the condemning of *Origen* is not there neither. True, neither ought it to bee; it was never ſent to, never publiſhed in this fift Councell: but if in any, in that provinciall Synod under *Mennas*, unto which it was ſent; and the Cardinall to prove that *Edict* to have beene a part of theſe Acts, brings no other, nor better proofe than his owne [*putamus* k,] a proofe ſo exceeding weake, that it is not worthy a refutation. The Epiſtle of *Iuſtinian* ſent to the Synod commanding them to condemne *Origen*, which is one of the fragments that *Binius* [l] hath added, is not among the Acts. True, nor ought it to be; for neither is it *Iuſtinians*, but an extract and briefe collection of *Cedrenus*, who out of the large Edict or Epiſtle, (as the Emperour calleth it) collected this; neither doth it any way belong to this, but to the former Synod. The condemnation of *Didymus* and *Evagrius*, ſaith *Binius* [m], together with *Origen*, was made in this fift Synod, as the ſecond Nicene Councell [n] witneſſeth, and that is not here among the Acts. That *Didymus* and *Evagrius* were *nominatim* condemned in the fift Synod, the ſecond Nicene Councell ſayth it not; no, if one would ſtraitly ſtand upon it, they do not ſay ſo much as that [o] they were at all, but that their doctrines touching preexiſtence were condemned. But ſay they ſayd it; *Didymus* and *Evagrius* were two earneſt Origeniſts [p], and defenders of *Origens* error. Now the fift Councell not onely condemneth *Origen* and his errors, *ſed eos qui ſimilia prædictis hæreticis ſapuerunt, vel ſapiunt*; *but all who teach or thinke the like that Origen did*: in which generality *Didymus* and *Evagrius*, and all Origeniſts are condemned; which generall condem-

k *an. 553. n. 242.*
l *Poſt Conc. 5. pa. 604. et pa. 606 b. indicant illa fragmenta, &c.*
m *Ib. pa. 606. b.*
n *Act. 1. pa. 306. a.*
o *Communi et generali anathemate vi ejecti ſunt Origenes, et Theodorus Mopſveſtenus, et quæcunq; ab Evagrio et Didymo dicta ſunt de præexiſtentia. Conc. Nic. 2. loco citat.*
p *Didymus et Evagrius ſectatores Origenis. Bin. loc. citat.*

condemnation is all that can be enforced out of the ſecond Nicene Synod. Thus all the three defects which *Baronius* and *Binius* labour to prove in theſe Acts about this cauſe of *Origen*, declare a foule maime in their owne wits and judgements, but none in the Acts, and doe evidently ſhew, that themſelves under colour of correcting theſe acts, doe indeed corrupt and falſifie the ſame.

7. And yet (which one can ſcarce with patience endure, or reade without ſcorne of their folly) they are not content to tell what is ſtoln or taken away touching this cauſe of *Origen* out of theſe acts, but like skilfull figure-flingers, they will name you the very thieſe, and tell particularly who maimed the Acts in this part. And who thinke you is it? Even *Theodorus* [q] Biſhop of *Cæsarea*; they have an implacable hatred to him; he is an Origeniſt, he the chiefe of the Origeniſts; and for love of *Origen* hee corrupted the acts of this fift Synod, and ſtole away the proceedings againſt *Origen*, the Anathematiſmes, the *Edict*, and *Epiſtle* of *Iuſtinian*. O how blinde and beſotted is a malicious minde? that is it which put this rare skill of divination into the heart of *Baronius* and *Binius*. There is nothing ſtolne, as theſe Acts doe demonſtrate, and yet they will tell you who took away the goods. They doe with *Theodorus* as the malicious Arians dealt [r] with *Athanaſius*, proclamed him for a murderer, and conjurer, and little leſſe than condemned him for killing *Arſenius*, and cutting off his right hand, which they brought into the open Court; whereas *Arſenius* was both alive, and a ſound man with both his hands: So this viperous Arian brood proclame *Theodorus* for cutting off one arme of theſe Acts; which yet hath no maime nor defect at all in that part. *Theodorus* was a Catholike Biſhop, a condemner and anathematizer of *Origen* and all his errors, and yet they will enforce you to beleeve that he is an heretike, an Origeniſt, the chiefe patron of the Origeniſts. Yet theſe men have not very well ſummed up their accounts. For how did *Theodorus* take away that which was againſt the Origeniſts, whereas hee ſuffered to ſtay in the Acts an anathema to *Origen*, and to the impious writings of *Origen*, and to all that thinke as did *Origen*, yea to all that doe not anathematize *Origen*? What ſillineſſe was it in the Cardinall, to think that *Theodorus* or any Origeniſt would ſpoyle the Acts, and take away ſome diſcourſes, and diſputations againſt *Origen*, and leave that which is the maine matter of all, the ſentence of condemnation againſt him, and his errors, yea againſt themſelves, (ſuppoſing them to be ſuch as the Cardinall ſlandereth them) and that alſo ſubſcribed by their owne hands, as an eternall witneſſe againſt them? So malicioufly blinded were the Cardinall and *Binius* in this cauſe, that ſo they ſpake againſt the Councell and the Catholike Biſhops thereof, they regard not how untruly, how unadviſedly they ſlander them. But neither is it a diſgrace to *Theodorus* to ſuffer like ſlander as did *Athanaſius*, nor is it any honour to the Cardinall and *Binius* to ſlander, and doe the like as their forefathers the old Arians have done before them. And thus much of the three firſt defects in theſe Acts, which all concerne the cauſe of *Origen*.

q *Quis dubitet id factũ ab Origeniſtis qui Synodo præfuêrũt, quorum patronus fuit Theodorus malorum omnium concinnator. Bar. an. 553. nu. 244. & intelligere poteſt quorum arte quæ in Synodo acta ſunt contra Origenem & ejus errores ex ea fuerint decurtata. ibid. Quis neget Theodorum Cæſareenſem abſtuliſſe ab actis hujus Concilij quæ ſuæ cauſæ (erat autẽ Origeniſtarum patronus) adverſabantur. Bin. Notis in Conc. 5. pa. 606. b.*

r *Ruff. lib. 1. Eccl. hiſt. ca. 17. & alij.*

Cap. XXIX.

The fourth defect *in the Synodall Acts pretended by Baronius*, for that the Emperors Epiſtle to the fift Councell is wanting therein, *refuted.*

1.  HE fourth *defect* which they finde in theſe Acts, is the want of that other *Epiſtle* of *Iuſtinian* directed to the Synod, ſet downe by *Cedrenus*, and out of him annexed by *Binius* [a] to the end of the Synod, as one of the fragments which were taken away from the Acts. Of it *Baronius* [b] thus writeth: *Cedrenus adjoyneth after this another Epiſtle of the Emperor ſent to the Synod, containing an hiſtory of the four generall Councells, in the end whereof divers things are written againſt Theodorus of Mopſveſtia*; the beginning of it is this, *Majores noſtri fidei cultores, &c.* That this ſame *Epiſtle* ſent to the Synod was inſerted among the Acts thereof, *nemo jure dubitârit, none may juſtly doubt*: ſo that by this you may perceive, *Quamplurima in eadem quinta Synodo deſiderari, that very many things are wanting in the Acts of this fift Councell.* Thus *Baronius*. No ſure: that cannot be hence perceived: but another thing is moſt evident, that the Cardinall is more malicious in carping at theſe Acts, and correcting Magnificat, than *Momus* himſelfe. May no man doubt but that this *Epiſtle* of *Iuſtinian* (as it is ſet downe by *Cedrenus*) was inſerted in the Acts of this fift Councell? what proofe hath the Cardinall for this his confident ſaying? Truly none at all: nor could hee finde any ſound proofe, if he had ſtudied for one thirty yeares: for none but a carping *Momus* can, and none at all ought to doubt of the contrary, that this Epiſtle which is in *Cedrenus*, neither was *Iuſtinians* Epiſtle, neither was ſent unto the Synod. *Iuſtinian* indeed ſent a very large and learned *Epiſtle* to the Biſhops of the Synod at their firſt aſſembling, containing altogether the like effect, (to wit, a hiſtory or narration of the foure former Councells, and a declaration of the impieties both of *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia*, and of the writing of *Theodoret*, and of the impious *Epiſtle* of *Ibas*:) by which he commanded and authorized the Synod to examine and decide that controverſie touching the *three Chapters*; and that being the true and authenticall *Epiſtle* of *Iuſtinian*, is extant in the Acts [c], and is the warrant for all that the Synod did. That which out of *Cedrenus* the Cardinall and *Binius* mention, is nothing elſe (as any man may eaſily ſee) but an epitome or extract which *Cedrenus* himſelfe, or ſome other undiſcreet abridger, collected out of the true *Epiſtle* of *Iuſtinian*. It is not the uſe of Emperours to ſend with their letters abridgements and brieſes of the ſame, eſpecially ſuch (of which ſort this is) as come farre ſhort of the maine ſcope of the ſame. Beſides, if there were nothing elſe, yet the untruths which the abbreviator ſets down, and that quite contrary to the mind of *Iuſtinian*, may teſtifie, it was neither writ, nor ſent by him to the Synod. In that Baronian Epiſtle *Eutyches* is ſayd [d] to approve the opinions

a *Epiſtola 2. Juſtin. ad Conc. Oecumenicum. 5. Bin. pa. 604.*

b *An. 553. nu. 243.*

c *Collat. 1. pa. 518. & ſequ.*

d *Eutyches Neſtorii opiniones probat in Frag. ex Cedr. apud Bin. pa. 605. b.*

opinions of *Neſtorius*; whereas the hereſie of *Eutyches* was quite contrary to that of *Neſtorius*, as *Iuſtinian* [i] truly obſerveth in his *Epiſtle*; for *Neſtorius taught two* [k] *natures to be in Chriſt, and to make two perſons*; *Eutyches taught as but one perſon, ſo but one* [l] *nature*. Yea the Eutycheans utterly condemned the Neſtorians, and with them all Catholikes, as Neſtorians, becauſe [m] they taught 2. natures after the adunation to remain in Chriſt, [n] *Qui dicit duas naturas, Neſtorianus eſt*. In that Baronian Epiſtle *Eutyches* is affirmed to follow *Neſtorius*, in that [o] he ſaid that the fleſh of Chriſt and ours are not of one nature; but *Neſtorius* taught no ſuch thing, but the clean contrary [p], the fleſh which Chriſt took of the bleſſed Virgin to be truly humane, and therefore the ſonne of *Mary* to be truly, but yet onely a man; as *Iuſtinian* alſo in his *Epiſtle* teacheth. In that Baronian Epiſtle, *Neſtorius* is ſayd [q] to have beene the maſter or teacher of *Theodorus*; but the quite contrary is truth, as both the whole fift [r] Councell often, and even in their *definitive* ſentence, and *Iuſtinian* [ſ] in his *Epiſtle* doe expreſly witneſſe. Are not *Baronius* and *Binius* rare men to cure the lameneſſe of Councels, who when the Acts are ſound and perfect, would patch unto them ſuch falſe and unworthy writings, containing ſo manifeſt untruths, repugnant to the authenticke records of the Acts? But woe come to all Councels, Fathers, and ancient writings, when they muſt be amended and cured by ſuch Surgeons as *Baronius* and *Binius*. Give me the moſt lame and impotent Councels that can be had, I had rather have them all to bee creeples, than to come under their deadly, unfortunate, and Harpyan hands, which defile every hiſtory or writing that they touch.

i *Neſtorio aliud dicente Deum verbum, et aliud Chriſtum, &c. Iuſt. epiſt. Coll. 1. pa. 519.*

k *In eo te laudo quod diſtinctionem naturarum ſecundum divinitatis et humanitatis rationem prædicas. Hæc enim vera et orthodoxa ſunt, &c. Sic Neſtorius ſcribit Cyrillo, in ea Epiſt. Neſt. quæ habetur tom. 1. Epheſ. Con. ca. 14*

l *Eutyches negat conſubſtantialem nobis eſſe carnem Domini. Iuſt. in Epiſt ad Synod. ſup. citat. et anathem. qui dixit duas naturas poſt adunationem, dicunt Eutychiani in conciliab. Eph. apud Conc. Chal. Act. 1.*

m *Exclamaverunt, de vicina Neſtoriana hæreſi infamantes nos, In duo ſeparate, interficite eos qui dicunt duas naturas, de Eutychianis loquitur, Conc. Chalc. Act. 1. pa. 8. a.* n *Eum qui dicit duas naturas in duo incidit, Qui dicit duas naturas, Neſtorianus eſt. ibid. pa. 12. a.* o *Eutyches Neſtorii opiniones probans, dicenſq; carnem Chriſti non ejuſdem cum noſtra eſſe naturæ. Epiſt. ex Cedr. pa. 605. b.* p *Vt liquet ex verbis Neſtorii ante citatis.* q *Opera Theodori Mopſveſteni, qui magiſtrum ſuum Neſtorium impie de rebus ſacris loquendo ſuperabat. Epiſt. ex Cedr. loc. cit.* r *Et docerent non ſolum diſcipulum impietatis Neſtorium, ſed etiam doctorem ejus Theodorum. Coll. 8. pa. 585. b.* ſ *Per Theodorum Mopſveſtenum, doctorem Neſtorij. Epiſt. Iuſt. Coll. 1. p. 519.*

CAP. XXX.

The fift defect *in the Synodall Acts pretended by* Baronius, for that the Conſtitution of Pope *Vigilius* concerning the *three Chapters* is wanting therein, *refuted.*

1. THe fift *defect* which the Cardinall hath ſpyed in theſe Acts, is, that the Conſtitution of Pope *Vigilius* is not now extant therein. Of it the Cardinall ſayth [a], *That it belongeth to the Acts of the fift Synod, is evidently declared by that which we have ſpoken*: and againe, this [b] Conſtitution as alſo many other things, *Noſcitur eſſe ſublatum, is knowne to be taken out of the Acts of the fift Synod*. How prove you Sir, that either it belongs to it, or is taken out of theſe Synodall acts? What? againe ſo rude and unmannerly as aske a reaſon of the Cardinall

a *An. 553. nu. 48*

b *Ibid. nu. 47.*

dinall? Is it not proved ſufficiently when *Baronius* hath ſayd it? Truly then it is diſproved ſufficiently when an oppoſer of *Baronius* hath denyed it. For any man for truth and credit may eaſily overſway *Baronius*. I pray, why ſhould the Popes *Conſtitution* bee part of the Acts, rather than the Emperours *Edict*? or why doth the Cardinall finde a defect in wanting the Papall, which is *hereticall*, and not of the Imperiall which is an *orthodoxall* decree?

2. *Baronius* will further tell you, out of which part of the Acts this is ſtolne. It [c] was offered to the Synod in their fift Collation, *Ad* [d] *hunc ipſum diem quintæ Collationis pertinere cognoſcitur*; *It is knowne that the Popes Conſtitution belongs to this yeare, and to this very day of the fift Collation.* And how I pray you is that knowne? Becauſe [e] the *Conſtitution* hath in the end of it the date of the day and yeare wherein *Vigilius* publiſhed it. A reaſon fit for none but a Cardinall. As if all Conſtitutions, Letters, and Edicts which beare date of a yeare and a day, belonged to that fift Collation, and were certainly ſtolne out of it. Was ever any infatuated, if not *Baronius* in this cauſe? But the *Conſtitution* beares date [f] on the 14. day of May, in the reigne of *Iuſtinian*, and the fift Collation of the Synod was on the ſame day. A like reaſon to the former: as if all Letters or Conſtitutions written on that day muſt needs be publiſhed in the Councell, or on that very day in their Collation. Admitting it was read, yet the contrary ſeemes much rather to follow, that it was not read on that day, but on ſome other after; for the *Conſtitution* is directed [g], and was ſent [h] to the Emperour: that could not be before the fourteenth day, on which it is dated, and in likelihood the Emperour both read and examined it with leaſure before he ſent it from him to the Councell: the length of the Conſtitution may eaſily perſwade any, that one day was little enough for that buſineſſe, ſuppoſing no other affaires to have diſtracted the Emperour. *Binius* conſidering this, and being better adviſed hereof, diſſenting from the Cardinall herein, tels us that the *Conſtitution* was read in their ſixt Collation, which was on the nineteenth [k] of May, foure or five dayes after the date and publiſhing of it. So uncertaine and unlikely is that, of which the Cardinall ſayth *Cognoſcitur*, it is knowne to belong to the fift Collation.

3. But indeed, as the Imperiall *Edict* was not, ſo neither was this Papal *Conſtitution* publikely read, either in the fift or ſixt, or any other Collation of this Synod, much leſſe was it ever any part of the Synodall Acts thereof. The Emperour, and ſo all the Biſhops of the Synod laboured, as much as they could, to draw the whole Church to unity of faith with themſelves, eſpecially Pope *Vigilius*, whoſe conſent might happily draw after it, if not the whole; yet a great part of the Weſterne Church, which were moſt earneſt in defence of the *Three Chapters*. They knew that in particular, and by name to condemne *Vigilius*, or his *Conſtitution*, might not only have exaſperated, but even utterly alienated the minde of *Vigilius*, and made him (and with him his adherents) more obſtinate in their hereſie. They ſought by ſilence to conceale and by charity to ſuppreſſe, as much as they could, that hereticall and diſgracefull *Conſtitution* of his, and by their lenity

c *Libellus Synodo oblatus pridie Idus Maÿ. an. 553. nu. 41. et Papæ libellus oblatus Synodo: nos hic (in 5. Collatione) ſuo loco reſtituendũ eſſe putamus.* ibid. nu. 47.
d *Ibid. nu. 48.*
e *Ibid.*
f *Pridie Idus Maÿ. Bar. an. 553. nu. 310. eo autem die habita 5. Collatio. an. eodem nu. 41.*
g *Glorioſiſſimo et clementiſſimo filio Iuſtiniano, Vigilius Epiſcopus; ita incipit Conſtit. Vigil. apud Bar. an. 553 nu. 50.*
h *Vigilius pollicitus fuit ſe miſſurum (decretũ ſuum ſeu Conſtitutum) ad ipſum Imperatorem atq; ad Synodum, quod et ingenuè præſtitit. Bar. an. eodem. nu. 47.*
i *Oblatum fuiſſe Concilio, Vigilij conſtitutum, &c. quibus non obſcure ſignificatur idem Conſtitutum in ſexto illo Patrum conſeſſu recitatum fuiſſe. Bin. Not. ad Conc. 5 pa. 610. a. et Ex Actis Concilii non obſcure colligitur ipſum (Conſtitutum) in ſexto Conſeſſu Epiſcoporum recitatum fuiſſe. idem pa 606. b.*
k *14. Kalendas Iunias. Coll. 6. in initio.*

lenity and faire meanes, to gaine him, and his conſent to them, yea, even to the truth it ſelfe: for this cauſe, though they knew full well, that *Vigilius* had ſet out that decree, yea, though they confuted all the ſubſtance thereof, and condemned both it, and him in generalities, yet they forbare at all to name *Vigilius*, or in particular to mention this his decree, that had beene to proclame hoſtility, and have made an abſolute breach betwixt them and *Vigilius* for ever.

4. Beſides this, which was a very juſt reaſon, not ſo much as to publiſh (as they did not) that *Conſtitution* in their Synod, the Emperour had alwayes a purpoſe to have (as in the ſeventh Collation was done) the Epiſtles of *Vigilius* to *Ruſticus* and *Sebaſtianus* to *Valentinianus* and others, openly read & publiſhed in the Councel: In them *Vigilius* by his *Apoſtolicall* authority decreeth the condemning of the *three Chapters*: what a diſgrace had this beene to *Vigilius* to publiſh firſt his *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution* in defence, and ſhortly after, his *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution* for condemning the ſame *Three Chapters*? How juſtly might this have incenſed *Vigilius*, and for ever with-held him from conſenting to them; who had proclamed him in their Councell, & recorded him in their Synodall Acts to bee ſuch a *Proteus*? Nay, this had extenuated and vilified for ever the authority of Pope *Vigilius*, & the holy *Apoſtolike* See, to record two conſtitutions, both proceeding *ex Tripode*, fighting *ex Diametro*, and by an unreconciliable contradiction oppoſed the one to the other. Seeing then both the Emperour, and the Councell meant by their ſo often expreſſing the conſent of *Vigilius* to them, and by their reciting his *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution* for condemning the *Three Chapters* in the ſeventh Collation, ſeeing they meant hereby to draw others to the like conſent to the truth, by the authority and credit of the Pope and his *Apoſtolicall* decree: it is not to bee imagined that the Emperour or Councell would at all, either publiſh in their Synod, or inſert among their Acts the contrary *Conſtitution* of *Vigilius* in defence of the *Three Chapters*; in doing whereof they ſhould not onely have for ever diſgraced *Vigilius*, but have much impaired the reputation of their owne wiſedome, and quite croſſed their principall deſigne: Nay, what will you ſay if *Baronius* himſelfe profeſſe the ſame? See, and wonder to ſee him infatuated in this point alſo. *The Biſhops*, ſaith he [1], *of this fift Councell, that they might pretend to have the conſent of Vigilius to thoſe things which they defined, expreſſed in their ſentence, that Vigilius had before both in writing and by word condemned theſe three Chapters, tacentes omnino quid ab ipſo per editum conſtitutum pendente Synodo pro defenſione trium Capitulorum decretum eſſet; wholly concealing, or ſaying nothing at all of that decree, which in the time of the Synod hee made for defence of thoſe three Chapters: Sicque nullam penitus de Vigilij Conſtitutione mentionem habendam eſſe duxerunt, ſo they thought fit to make no mention at all of the Conſtitution of Vigilius, wherein he defended the three Chapters.* So *Baronius*: whom, ſpeaking the truth, I gladly embrace, and oppoſe him to himſelfe ſpeaking an untruth in malice to theſe Synodall Acts.

[1] Bar. an. 553. nu. 218.

5. Now if none of theſe reaſons, nor yet *Baronius* his owne expreſſe teſtimony can perſwade, but ſtill the Cardinall or his friends will re-

ply with his *cognoſcitur*. It is certainly knowne, that this Papall *Conſtitution* did belong to this Synod, yea, to the fift Collation thereof; I would gladly intreat ſome of them to tell us in this, as in the former concerning *Origen*, who was the thiefe, or robber, that cut out, or pickt away *his holineſſe* Conſtitution; a more capitall crime than the expiling of the Delphian Temple, or the houſe of *Iupiter Ammon*. Touch the Popes owne writings, even his *Apoſtolicall* decree delivered out of the holy Chaire? what *Clement*? what *Ravailack* might be ſo impious, ſo audacious, ſo ſacrilegious? was it ſome Origeniſt? no certainly, the *Conſtitution* defending, *that none after their death might be condemned*, was a ſhield and ſafe charter for *Origen* to bring him to heaven. Was it ſome Monothelite? nothing leſſe; they knew that this *Conſtitution* was the overthrow of the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and all the former holy Coûcels, *Hoc Ithacus velit*, they would have wiſht the *Conſtitution* to have ſtood for ever: whom may we deeme then to have ſtolne away that Papall decree? Truly by the old Caſſian rule, *Cui bono*, none elſe but either ſome of the Popes themſelves, or ſome of their favourites, who being aſhamed to ſee ſuch an *hereticall* Conſtitution of Pope *Vigilius* ſtand among the Acts, judged theft and ſacriledge a leſſer crime, than to have the Popes Chaire thought *fallible* and hereticall. Now becauſe I can imagine none to have beene ſo preſumptuous, and ſuch is my charity and favourable opinion of thoſe holy fathers, and their children alſo, that they would never commit ſuch an hainous crime, as with ſacriledge to maime the Acts of the holy Councels; I doe therefore here abſolve and acquit them all of this crime, promiſing againſt any adverſary, be it *Baronius* himſelfe, to defend their innocency in this matter, untill ſome of *Baronius* his friends can either bring ſome further evidence againſt them, or elſe prove, which I thinke they will hardly be able, that a decree, which was never extant among the Synodall Acts, can be ſtolne or cut away out of the Synodall Acts.

CAP.

CAP. XXXI.

The ſixt defect *in the Synodall Acts preceded by* Baronius, *for that the decree which advanced* Ieruſalem *to patriarchall dignity is wanting therein, refuted.*

1. 

HE ſixt and laſt *defect* is of all the reſt moſt memorable, concerning *the advancing of Ieruſalem to a Patriarchall See*, and annexing ſome Churches unto it. That this was done in the fift Councell *Baronius* [a] proves by *Guil. Tyrius* [b], who writeth, *that in the fift Synod in the time of Iuſtinian, Vigilius, Eutychius, and the reſt decreed, that this Biſhopricke of Ieruſalem ſhould have the place of a Patriarke, with the reſt:* And becauſe it was ſituate in a manner in the limits of the Biſhop of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, and ſo there [c] was no meanes for it to have ſubordinate Biſhops, unleſſe ſomewhat were taken from either of thoſe Patriarkſhips, therefore it ſeemed good to the Synod to take part from either; ſo they tooke from the Biſhop of *Antioch* two Provinces, *Cæſarea* and *Scythopolis*; and two other from the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, *Ruba* and *Beritus*; beſides which Metropolitane Sees, they tooke alſo from the ſame Patriarks divers Biſhopricks, and erected ſome other; all which (being in number twenty five) they ſubjected to their new founded Patriarke of *Ieruſalem*. This is the ſumme of that which *Guil. Tyrius*, and out of him *Baronius* delivereth, and *Binius* [d] addeth this as a fragment or ſcrap of the fift Councell, wch is now not found among the Acts therof. *Baronius* [e] further gloſſing on this text, tels us, that though *Iuvenalis* had attempted and obtained this before in the Councell of *Chalcedon*, when the [f] Pope Legates were abſent, yet Pope *Leo* reſiſting it, he prevailed not, nor was the matter put in execution; but at this [g] time the ancient order inſtituted by the Nicene Councell, being inverted, *Cæſarea* was now firſt of all made ſubject to the Church of *Ieruſalem*, which now was become a Patriarchall See.

2. This whole paſſage of *Baronius* (approving that teſtimony of *Guil. Tyrius* which is juſtly refuted by *Berterius* [h]) I cannot tell what to call, but ſure I am, it conſiſts of divers untruths, not ſo much upon ignorance (then his ſinne had beene leſſe) as maliciouſly objected againſt the Acts of this holy Synod; ſome of them I will explane, beginning with that which is the maine point of all. Firſt then it is untrue, that this fift Synod advanced the See of *Ieruſalem* to a Patriarkſhip. Not to the name and title of a Patriarke, for that it had long before, as *Bellar.* [i] and *Binius* [k] profeſſe; & though it was but a ſingle Biſhorick, ſubject, as both *Ierome*, [l] and the Nicene [m] Councell declare, to the Biſhop

a *An.* 553. *nu.* 245. *Alia illa deſiderari noſcuntur, quibus agebatur de adjectis Patriarchatui Hieroſolymitano Eccleſiis, &c.*

b *De Bello ſacro, lib.* 24. *ca.* 12.

c *Non habens unde illi urbi ordinaret ſuffraganeos, niſi utrique Patriarchæ aliquid detraheret.*

d *Bin. inter fragmenta addit poſt Chc.* 5 *pa.* 606. *a.*

e *An.* 553. *nu.* 246.

f *Poſt abſentiam Legatorum. Ibid.*

g *Sic igitur in verſo antiquo ordine à Nicæna Conſtituto inſtituto, Cæſarienſis Eccleſia, totius Paleſtinæ Metropolis nunc primum ſubjecta eſt Hieroſolymitanum Eccleſiæ. Bar. Ibid.*

h *Diatr.* 2. *ca.* 2.

i *Hieroſolimitanus per annos ferè quingentos habita eſt quarta Patria, cholis ſed nomine non re, ſeu honore non poteſtate. Bell. lib.* 1. *de Pontif. Rom. ca.* 24. § *Porro.*

k *Binius verba Bellar. repetit, et ait id patere ex Conc. Nic. Can.* 7. *notis in Epiſt.* 3.

Anaclet. to. 1. *Conc. pa.* 305. *& vet. in Conc. Nicen. ca.* 7. *pa.* 319. *a.* l *Hæc illi (in Conc. Nic.) decernitur ut Paleſtina Metropolis Cæſarea ſit, et totius Orientis Antiochia. Hier. Epiſt. ad Pammach. contra Joban. Epiſ. Hieroſ.* m *Habeat illa honoris conſequentiam (poſt Antiochiam) Metropoli propria dignitate ſervata. Conc. Nic. Can.* 7.

ſhop

ſhop of *Antioch*, as his Patriarke, and to the Biſhop of *Ceſarea Paleſtina*, (for there is another in *Cappadocia*,) as his Metropolitane, yet for honor of our Saviors reſurrectiõ in that place, it had the name of [n] Patriark, and preeminency in Councels [o] to the Biſhop of *Caſarea*. Not to the authoritie and power of a Patriarke, for that it had, and had it juſtly, long before this fift Councell, even by the decree and judgement of the Councell of *Chalcedon*. *Iuvenalis* [p] had ſued for it in the Epheſine Councell, but the Biſh. of *Antioch*, as it ſeemeth, then being unwilling to manumit him, & as it were, free him from his ſubjection, *Cyrill* reſiſted it & writ to Pope *Leo*, praying him to do the like. But after long contention both parties being throughly agreed, the matter was brought to the Councell of *Chalcedon*, where *Maximus* and *Iuvenalis*, the Biſhops of both Sees, firſt of all, and before the whole Councell, profeſſed that they were both willing, *that* [q] *the Biſhop of Antioch ſhould hold the two Pheniciaes and Arabia, and the Biſhop of Ieruſalem ſhould hold the three Paleſtinaes*, and they both requeſted the whole Synod *to decree, confirme, and ratifie the ſame*. The whole Councell thereupon by their decree cõfirmed the ſame, all the moſt reverẽd Biſhops cryed [r], *We all ſay the ſame, and we conſent thereunto*. After them the moſt glorious *Iudges* in the name of the Emperor, added Imperiall authority and the royall aſſent to the Synods decree, ſaying, *Firmum etiam per noſtrum decretũ & ſententiam Concilij in omni tempore permanebit hoc; this ſhall abide firme for ever by our decree, and by the judgement of the Councell, that the Church of Antioch have under it the two Pheniciaes, and Arabia; & the Church of Ieruſalem have under it the three Paleſtines*. Thus the Iudges. The ſame Decree of this Councell at *Chalcedon* is expreſly teſtified both by *Evagrius* [s] and *Nicephorus* [t]. So untrue it is which *Guil. Tyrius*, and out of him *Baronius* avoucheth, that the Church of *Ieruſalem* was firſt made a Patriarchall See, or had the Provinces and Metropolitanes of *Caſarea* and *Scithopolis* annexed unto it by the fift Councell, that it is undoubtedly certaine, that it had with the title and dignity, true Patriarchal authority and power over divers Provinces, together with their inferiour Biſhops conferred upon it, with a plenary conſent of the whole Church in the Councell of *Chalcedon*. And that you may ſee the moſt ſhamefull dealing both of *Bar.* and *Binius* in another place (where their choller againſt this fift Councell was not moved) they acknowledge that truth; for intreating of the Councell at *Chalcedon*: *In this ſeventh Seſſion of it*, ſaith *Baronius* [u], (and the like doth *Binius* [x]) *was the controverſie cõpoſed betwixt the Biſhops of Antioch & Ieruſalẽ, and the cauſe being judged, the two Phenicia and Arabia, were given to the Biſhop of Antioch, and the three Paleſtines were adjudged to the Biſhop of Hieruſalem, ex quibus jam perſpicuè apparet jus Metropolis in Hieroſolymitanam Eccleſiam eſſe tranſlatum; whence it doth evidently appeare, that the right of the Metropolis which before belonged to the Biſhop of Caſarea was tranſlated to the Biſhop of Ieruſalem*. So they: who yet in hatred againſt the Acts of the fift Councell with faces of Adamant deny that truth which here they confeſſe to be cleare and conſpicuous.

3. But (ſaith the Cardinall [y]) the *decree* of *Chalcedon* was made, *poſt abſentiam Legatorum*, when the Popes Legates were now gone, and of

n *Hieroſolimitanus Epiſcopus ſedebat. 4. loco, ſed nulli Archi-Epiſcopo vel Epiſcopo præerat. Bell. loc. cit.*

o *Nam ſedit 4. loco in Concilio Niceno, et ſubſcribit ante Epiſcopum Caſarienſem in Conc. Niceno, et Conſtant. ut ex ſubſcriptione liquet, et in Conc. Chalc. Act 5.*

p *Epiſt. 62. Leonis.*

q *Placuit mihi (ait Maximus) et Iuvenali propter multam contentionem ut ſedes Antiochena habeat duas Phœnicias et Arabiam, ſedes autem Hieroſolymorum habeat tres Paleſtinas, et rogamus ex decreto veſtro hæc firmari. Conc. Chalc. Act. 7. pa. 105.*

r *Ibid.*

ſ *Evag. l. 2. ca. 18*

t *Nic. Calliſt. lib. 15. ca. 30.*

u *An. 451. nu. 124.*

x *Not. in Conc. Chalc. pa. 184. b.*

y *Tom. 553. nu. 246.*

ſo they being abſent, is to be held invalid. O the forehead of the Cardinall! Were the Popes Legats abſent? were they gone? Truly they were not onely preſent at this *decree*, and conſenting unto it, but after it was propoſed by *Maximus* and *Iuvenalis*, they were the very firſt men that gave ſentence therein, whoſe ſentence the whole Councell followed. For thus it is ſayd [z], *Paſcaſinus and Lucentius the moſt reverend Biſhops, and Boniface a Prcsbyter, theſe holding the place of the Apoſtolike See, ſaid by Paſcaſinus; Theſe things betwixt Maximus and Iuvenalis are knowne to be done for their good and peace; & noſtra humilitatis interloquutione firmantur, and they are confirmed by the interloquution of our humility; ut nulla impoſterum de hac cauſa ſit contentio, that never hereafter there ſhould be any contention about this matter betweene theſe Churches.* Is it credible that the Cardinall could be ſo audacious and impudent, as to utter ſuch palpable untruths? Vnleſſe he had quite put off, I ſay not modeſty, but reaſon, ſenſe, and almoſt humane nature. Let this ſtand for the ſecond capitall untruth in this paſſage.

z *Conc. Chalc. Act. 7. pa. 105. a*

4. Yet Pope *Leo* himſelfe, ſaith *Baronius* [a], withſtood that *Decree* of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, becauſe it was prejudiciall to the rights of other Churches; and by reaſon he conſented not, it was not put in execution, as it was after this *Decree* of the fift Synod. Had the Cardinall and his friends beene well adviſed, they would feare, and bee much aſhamed once to mention the reſiſtance of Pope *Leo* to the Councell at *Chalcedon*, either in thoſe Patriarks, or in the other of *Conſtantinople*: for firſt the reſiſtance of *Leo*, which was meerely ineffectuall, demonſtrates, that the Popes contradiction, with all his might and power, can neither diſanull nor infringe the judgement of a generall Councell; which is no ſmall prejudice to his Princehood, or Princely ſupremacy. Againe, it convinceth *Leo* of a very foule and unexcuſable errour, ſeeing *Leo* judged the Nicene Canons concerning matters of order, policie, and government of the Church (ſuch as theſe are about the extent of Sees, or ſuperiority of one Patriarke or Biſhop above another) to be unalterable and eternall, no leſſe than the decrees of faith: *The condition* (ſaith hee [b]) *of the Nicene Canons* (in the margent hee points at the ſixt and ſeventh, both wch concerne the limits of Sees) *being ordained by the Spirit of God, is in no part ſoluble*; and whatſoever is diverſe from their Conſtitution, *omni penitus auctoritate vacuum eſt; is utterly voide of all authority, by whomſoever it bee decreed*, fewer or moe. Againe [c], the Nicene fathers, after they had condemned *Arius*, made lawes of Eccleſiaſticall Canons, *manſuras uſque in finem mundi, which are to ſtand in force untill the end of the world*; and if ought be any where preſumed to bee done otherwiſe than they have decreed, *ſine cunctatione caſſatur, it is preſently made voide.* Againe [d], the priviledges of Churches being inſtituted by the Canons of the holy Fathers, and confirmed by the Nicene decrees, *nulla poſſunt improbitate convelli, nulla novitate mutari; they can bee infringed by no improbity, they can by no novelty bee altered.* Againe [e], concerning *Iuvenalis* Biſhop of *Ieruſalem*, who was now truly made a Patriarke, for keeping the Statutes of the holy fathers, which in the Nicene Synod are confirmed, *inviolabilibus decretis, by inviolable decrees*; I admoniſh your ſanctity,

a *Loco citato.*

b *Leo Epiſt. 53.*

c *Epiſt. eidem.*

d *Epiſt. 54.*

e *Epiſt. 61.*

ſanctity, that the lawes of the Churches remaine; let no mans ambition covet that which is another mans, let no man ſeeke by impairing another to advance himſelfe, for though they thinke to ſtrengthen their deſires by Councels, *infirmum atque irritum erit quicquid à prædictorum patrum Canonibus diſcreparit*; whatſoever is diverſe from theſe Nicene Canons ſhall bee void. Laſtly [f] to *Maximus* Biſhop of *Antioch*, let it ſuffice that I pronounce this in generall, *ad omnia, for all matters*, concerning limits of Sees, and the like, that if any thing bee attempted by any man, in any Synod, againſt the Statutes of the Nicene Canons, *nihil præjudicij poteſt inviolabilibus inferre decretis*, it can bring no prejudice to theſe unalterable and inviolable decrees. Thus Pope *Leo* erronioufly judging the order ſet downe in the Nicene Canons, for the bounds and preheminence of Biſhops to be for ever, or by any Councell whatſoever immutable.

f *Epiſt.* 62.

g *Hæc ſancta & magna Synodus, tam in ſeniori & nova Roma, quam in ſede Alexandriæ, Antiochiæ et Hieroſolymorum priſcam conſuetudinē decernit in omnibus conſervari, ita ut eorum præſules univerſorum Metropolitanorum qui ab ipſis promoveniur, habeant poteſtatem, ad convocādum eos, ad coercendum et corrigendum. Can.* 17 *Conc.* 8. *apud Bin. pa.* 850.

h *Conc. Later.* 4. *habitum ſub Innoc.* 3. *ca.* 5.

5. See now the wiſedome of the Cardinall in alleaging Pope *Leo*. If the decree at *Chalcedon* was not of force becauſe *Leo* contradicted it, then neither can that other decree, ſuppoſed to bee made in the fift Councell, be of force, becauſe *Leo* contradicteth it alſo, for by *Leo* his judgement, at no time, by no perſon, by no Councell, by no authority can the order ſet downe at Nice bee changed. If that at *Chalcedon* was not in force, to which the Popes Legates conſented, how can the Cardinall thinke this of the fift Councell to bee of force, to which neither Pope nor Legate conſented, nor was ſo much as preſent in the Councell? If the judgment of *Leo* ſtand for good, then neither is, nor ever was either *Conſtantinople* or *Ieruſalem* Patriarchall Sees; & then the decree of the eighth Councell [g], and the [h] Laterane, and I know not how many Councels muſt bee rejected as unlawfull and impious, if the judgement of *Leo* be (as by the eighth Councell and their Laterane it is adjudged) erronious, then was *Ieruſalem* a Patriarchall See, notwithſtanding the contradiction of *Leo* to that decree. In a word, if *Leo* his judgement be of force, it repeales the decreee of the fift, eighth, and all other generall Councels decreeing this; if it be not of force, it neither did nor could infringe the decree of *Chalcedon*. So unadviſed was the Cardinall in alleaging the reſiſtance of *Leo* to that decree.

i *Quo minus ea (quæ Chalcedone obtinuit Iuvenalis) executioni mandata eſſent, Leo Rom. Pont. interceſſit. Nunc ergo primum (in Concilio* 5.*) Hieroſolymorum Eccleſia Patriarchatu verè auctа cognoſcitur. Bar. an.* 553. *nu.* 246.

k *Act.* 7.

l *Novel.* 131. *ca.* 1, 2.

m *Data eſt Novel. Baſilio Coſſ. ut in fine ejus liquet, is vero eſt annus Regni Juſtiniani* 15. *et Conc.* 4. *habitum an. Inſt.* 27.

6. And to ſatisfie the Cardinall yet a little more fully, it is an untruth which hee ſaith [i], that the *Decree* of *Chalcedon* was not put in execution before the time of this fift Synod, and this ſuppoſed decree therof, for the Councell of *Chalcedon* [k] decreed that their ſentence in advancing *Ieruſalē* to a Patriarchall See, ſhould ſtand in force, *in omni tempore*, and therfore doubtleſſe even then, and from that very time it was truely a Patriarchall See, the contradiction of *Leo* no more hindring it the very next or ſecond yeare, than it did two hundred or two thouſand yeares after that decree made. Againe, as it is certaine for the See of *Conſtantinople*, that it both before and after the *Decree* of *Chalcedon* (which was not introductory but confirmative in that point) exerciſed Patriarchall authority, *Iuſtinian* alſo by his Imperiall law [l] made ſome twelve [m] yeares before the fift Councell, confirming the ſame; and ſo it is not to bee doubted but the Church of *Ieruſalem* did

did the very like in it owne Patriarchall Dioceſſe, eſpecially conſidering, that the Imperiall law of *Iuſtinian* is as forcible [n] for the one as for the other: So that for any one to have denyed or ſought then to have infringed the Patriarchall authority confirmed to *Conſtantinople*, conferred to *Ieruſalem* by the Councell of *Chalcedon*, had brought him into danger not onely of Eccleſiaſticall cenſure, but of civill puniſhments, and of the Emperours high indignation: Or if the Cardinall will not bee ſatisfied unleſſe hee ſee the practice of that Patriarchall authority; let him looke in the general Councell under *Mennas*, and there hee ſhall ſee *Iohn* Biſhop of *Ieruſalem* hold a Provinciall Councell of the Biſhops of the three *Paleſtines*, *qui ſub eo ſunt*, *who were under him*, two of which, as by their ſubſcriptions appeare, were the Metropolitane Biſhops of *Cæſarea* and *Scythopolis*, with thirty moe; ſo many were then ſubject to the Patriarke of *Ieruſalem*. Againe, in another Provinciall Councell [p] held at *Ieruſalem* the tenth yeare of *Iuſtinian*, *Peter*, Patriarch of *Ieruſalem*, is Preſident [q] over all the Biſhops of the three Paleſtines there aſſembled with him; two of which were the foreſaid Metropolitanes. So untrue it is which *Baronius* to maintaine the falſe teſtimony of *Guil. Tyrius* avoucheth, that the *Decree* of *Chalcedon* was not put in execution before this fift Councell. Let this bee ſcored for his third capitall untruth in this ſhort paſſage.

7. A fourth untruth is that which is ſaid in the fragments, that the Councell had no other meanes to erect this Patriarchſhip of *Ieruſalem*, but by taking part from both the other of *Antioch* and *Alexandria*, for there was another meanes, as both the *Decree* of *Chalcedon*, and the event did ſhew, and nothing at al was taken from the See of *Alexandria*.

8. A fift untruth is, that they tooke from *Alexandria* the Metropolitane Sees and Provinces of *Ruba* and *Berithus*, for neither of theſe Sees belonged to the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, but of *Antioch*; of them both *Berterius* [r] (refuting this very fragment, which the Cardinall and *Binius* ſo gladly ſnatch at) ſaith [ſ], *certainly Ruba is placed by Ptolome in Syria*; and it is manifeſt, that *Berithus* is the Metropolis of *Phenice*, neare *Libanus*: *Syria autem & Phenicia Orientis Provinciæ omnibus notæ ſunt*; *but Syria and Phenicia to be Provinces of the Eaſt* (and ſo belonging formerly to the See of *Antioch*) *all men doe know*. Thus hee; and for *Berithus* the matter is certaine, that it is not neare the bounds or limits of *Alexandria*, for that it is in the Province of *Phenicia*, not onely *Ptolome* [c] ſhewes, but the ſubſcriptions of the Biſhops, both in the Nicene [d], in the firſt Conſtantinopolitane [e], and *Chalcedon* [f] Councels, in all which the Biſhop of *Berithus* is ſet in the Province of *Phenicia*; whence againe a ſixt untruth is to bee obſerved in that fragment of *Tyrius*, for it ſaith [g], that *Berithus* was granted to the new Patriarch of *Ieruſalem*; whereas it is cleare, that it was in *Phenicia*, & that the two *Phenicia* [h], both by the agreement of *Max.* and *Iuvenalis*, and by the de-

n *Sancimus vicem legum obtinere ſanctas Eccleſiaſticas regulas quæ à ſanctis 4. Concilijs expoſitæ ſunt, aut firmatæ. Nov. ca. dem ca. 1.*

o *Act. 5. pa. 455. et ſeq.*

p *Conc. Hieroſ. contra Scverum et alios extat, to. 2 Conc. pa 472.*

q *Præſidente ſanctiſſimo Patriarcha Petro aſſiſtentibus Epiſcopis trium Paleſtinarum. Ibid.*

r *Diatr. 2. ca. 2.*

ſ *At certè Ruba à Ptolomæo in Syria ponitur, et Berithum Phænices Libani Metropolim eſſe conſtat, Syria autem et Phænice Orientis Provinciæ omnibus notæ ſunt. Nihil igitur ab Ægyptiaca Alexandrini Patriarchæ dioceſi accepit Hieroſolymitanus. Quod ſi ita eſt, non temere Tyrio et veteri huic ſcripto (fragmento ſcilicet Baronio & Binio) fides adhibenda. Ber. Ibid.*

c *Ptol. Geog. lib. 5. ca 15. ubi Berithum ponit ſitum in Syria.*

d *Provinciæ Phœnices Gregarius Berithi, pa. 310. b.*

e *Provinciæ Phœnices Timotheus Beritius, pa. 513. a.*

f *Euſt. Berithi civitatis Phœnices maritimæ. Act. 1. pa. 2. a.*

g *Subtraxerunt Alexandrino Eccleſiam Berithenſem; et quoniam iterum eundem Patriarcham (Hieroſolymitanum) oportebat habere prater ſupradictos Metropolitanos, &c. Frag. ſup. citato.*

h *Concil. Chalc. Act 7. pa. 105. ut ſedes Antiochena habeat duas Phœnicias, &c.*

tree

eree of the Councell of *Chalcedon* did belong to the See and Biſhop of *Antioch*, and not of *Ieruſalem*.

9. Is not this now thinke you a worthy fragment which *Baronius* and *Binius* have found to be wanting, and will you, nill you, will needs faſten to the fift Councell? Are not they excellent Surgeons to cure lame Councels? who to the faire and authenticke Acts and Records of this Synod would patch ſuch a rablement of untruths, quite repugnant to the minde of this fift Synod? For ſeeing as *Gregory* [i] truly ſaith, it was *in omnibus ſequax*, in all things a follower of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, moſt certainly it never either decreed or approved this of taking ought from the See of *Alexandria*, or of adding *Berithus* and *Ruba* to the See of *Ieruſalem*; both which are directly contrary to the *Decree* of *Chalcedon*, which this fift Councell followeth. Let the Cardinall and *Binius* themſelves feed upon theſe and ſuch like ſcraps and huskes, they are fit and dainty meat for the Cardinals tooth and palate, which reliſheth little, unleſſe it have a touch of falſhood. But as I ſayd before, ſo I here againe proclame, let all Councels be a thouſand times lame, rather than receive any crutches of the Cardinals and of *Binius* deviſing and framing. And now you have all their *defectives*, wherein I doubt not but every one ſeeth both the defects to reſt in their corrupted judgement, and the truth of theſe Acts to bee much more confirmed hereby; ſeeing neither the craft, nor malice, nor extreme labour of *Baronius* and *Binius* was able to finde ſo much as any one thing which is wanting or defective in them.

i *Lib. 7. Ind. 2. Epiſt. 54.*

CAP. XXXII.

The two firſt additions *to the Synodall Acts pretended by Baronius*, for that the Epiſtle of *Mennas* to *Vigilius*, and the two lawes of *Theodoſius* are falſly inſerted therein; *refuted.*

1. 

Et us in the laſt place, ſaith *Baronius* [a], ſee what things Impoſtours have publiſhed under the name of the fift Synod; *Quæve* [b] *ſpuria eidem acceſſerunt, and what counterfeit additions are inſerted in theſe Acts.* Of theſe in generall the Cardinall [c] tels us, *Pudenda planè in iſtis intexta habentur, there are inſerted very ſhamefull matters into theſe Acts*, ſuch as are altogether unworthy of an oecumenical Synod. An haynous crime indeed, if the Cardinall can juſtifie this. For though we might deplore the defects if ought were wanting, yet that is no prejudice to the truth of that which remaineth, no more than the extreme want and ſhipwracke of the Nicene Acts, doth or can diſcredit the truth of the Canons which are come ſafe to land. But if in theſe Acts which now are extant, and paſſe for the true and faithfull Acts of the fift Synod, Impoſtors have inſerted falſe and counterfeit writings, that may cauſe one juſtly to miſdoubt the truth of theſe acts which wee have: for why (will ſome ſay) may not that part, or any one

a *Iam ad poſtremum videamus quæ ab impoſtoribus fuerunt 5. Synodi nomine pervulgata. Bar. an. 553. nu. 247.*
b *An. eod. nu. 238.*
c *An. eod. nu. 29.*

one bee forged or foiſted in, as well as this or that? Let us then ſee how well the Cardinal doth prove this redundant corruption in theſe Acts which now are extant of this fift Councell: his proofes thereof are five.

2. The firſt [d] is taken out of the ſixt generall Councell, in which when the Monothelites alledged an Epiſtle of *Mennas* to *Vigilius* as out of the Acts of the fift Synod, *It was proved that thoſe Acts were corrupted, and that the heretikes had inſerted three quaternions, that is, foure and twenty leaves into the ſame Acts.* Againe [e], in the 7. Action or Collation it was found further, *that they added two Epiſtles of Vigilius, one to Iuſtinian, and the other to Theodora; by which you ſee,* ſaith the Cardinal [f], *that the Acts of the fift Synod have beene foully corrupted by the Monothelites.* We ſee it indeed. And wee ſee withall another thing no leſſe remarkable and cleare, that the Cardinall is an inſignious ſlanderer, and playes the trifling Sophiſter in the higheſt degree. Who ever doubted or denyed, but that ſome copies of the Acts of this Synod have beene corrupted? of this, none that read the ſixt [g] Councell can make the leaſt queſtion in the world. For three corrupted copies were produced [h] and examined, and ſome other were mentioned, and the authors, both who falſified them, and who writ the inſerted additions are all there recorded. Nay the three corrupted copies were not onely diſcovered, but *accurſed* [i], *defaced* [k], and *raced* before the whole Synod, ſo farre as any corruption could bee found. Doth the Cardinall know any man to defend as ſincere, or juſtifie one of thoſe corrupted Monothelite copies? If he doe, the ſixt Councell is an unreſiſtable record againſt ſuch; and we will joyne with him in confuting ſuch audaciouſneſſe. Or will the Cardinall ſay, that the Acts of the fift Synod which are now extant, either have thoſe additions, or were written and taken out of thoſe corrupted and falſified copies? It is as cleare as the Sun they are not, for not one of thoſe Monothelite additions are in theſe Acts now extant. Theſe Acts, and no other are they which we defend, and which the Cardinall undertooke to diſgrace, and prove to bee corrupted, and to have forgeries patched unto them. Againſt theſe Acts, the Cardinalls proofe out of the ſixt Synod is ſo idle, and ſo ridiculouſly ſophiſticall, as not diſputing *ad idem*; that hee had need to pray that the Sophiſters in our Schooles heare not of, and applaud his rare skill in Logicke. If becauſe ſome copies were corrupted by the Monothelites, thoſe which moſt certainly eſcaped their hands muſt bee condemned, then no deed, nor teſtament, though never ſo truly authenticall, may be truſted, for a forgerer may exſcribe it, and adde what he pleaſeth in his extracted copy; or becauſe the Romane copies of the Nicene Canons were corrupted by [l] *Zozimus*, *Bonifacius*, or ſome of their friends, therefore the authenticke records thereof (the true copies of which the Africane Biſhops with much labour purchaſed from *Conſtantinople* and *Alexandria*,) muſt be diſtruſted: which yet the Africane Synod (Saint *Auſten* among the reſt) ſo much honoured, that they gave a juſt check to the Pope, and manifeſted that blot in him, which all the water in Tiber will never waſh away.

d *Monothelitarum fuit inventum ut ſub tit. lo 5. Synodi, epiſtolam Mennæ ediderint. Bar. an. 553. nu. 247.*

e *Duæ in eis (7. Actione Concil. 5.) Epiſtolæ inventæ ſunt quas commentitias eſſe & ſuppoſititias manifeſte probarunt ibid.*

f *Vides igitur quam ſæpe rit 5. Synodus tum ab Origeniſtis, tum à Monothelitis diverſis temporibus lanciata. ibid.*

g *Act. 3. & Act. 14.*

h *Act. 14.*

i *Anathema libro qui dicitur Mennæ ad Vigilium, & qui eũ finxerunt ſive ſcripſerunt. Anathema libellis qui dicuntur facti fuiſſe à Vigilio ad Iuſtinianum et Theodorum. Anathema ſimul eis qui falſaverunt acta ſanct. & univerſalis quinti Concilij. ibid. pa. 74 b.*

k *Chartaceum volumen quod falſatum eſt decernimus caſſari in locis, in quibus adjectiones ſunt factæ: veruũ libros etiam eos, obelis obduci, in locis in quibus depravati ſunt, & caſſari, &c. ibid. pa. 73.*

3. The Cardinall [m], and after him *Binius* [n], tels us a great matter and rare newes, that in Pope *Gregories* time, the Acts of this Synod were intire, and that he sent the genuine copy thereof to Queen *Theodalinda*: (An evidence by the way that the Cardinall [o] wittingly and wilfully slandereth the acts which *Gregory* followed to have beene corrupted; wherein *Ibas* is truly said (as the true genuine acts doe also witnesse) to have denyed the *Epistle* to be his.) But let that passe: why doe they mention the Copies of the Acts to have been sincere in *Gregories* time, as if after that time no true copies thereof could be found? In the sixt Councell more than 70. [p] yeares after the death of *Gregory*, divers true, ancient, and incorrupt copies [q] were produced of the same: one of them were found in the very Registry at *Constantinople*, which the Monothelites of that See had not corrupted and falsified; by it and the other true and entire copies, were discovered and convinced the corruption of those three bookes which they cancelled and defaced; how will or can either the Cardinall or *Binius*, or any other, prove that these Acts now extant, are not consonant to those, or taken out, or published according to them? Truly I doe verily perswade my selfe, considering both that the sixt Councell was so carefull and vigilant to preserve the true Acts; and also that these which now we have, are so exact, as before I have declared, that these are no other than the copies of those selfe same ancient and incorrupted acts (save some few and light faults, which by the writers thereof have happened) which Pope *Gregory* had, and in that sixt Councell were read, and commended to all posterity. And I doubt not but the fraud of heretikes being then so fully and openly discovered, the Church ever since hath most diligently and curiously, not onely carefully, preserved the same. Which may well be thought to bee the true cause, why of all the eight Councels the Acts of these three last, that at *Chalcedon*, this fift, and the other of the sixt, are come most safe and intire unto our hands. Howsoever, certaine it is that the Cardinall and *Binius* doe most childishly sophisticate, in accusing the copies of the Acts now extant, (which onely we defend) to be corrupted, because those three or moe copies of the Acts which were produced in the sixt Synod, (which we detest and condemne much more than the Cardinall) were falsified by the Monothelites, none of those false additions being found in these.

4. The second imposture or fictitious writing which *Baronius* observeth to be inserted in these acts, are the two lawes of *Theodosius* against *Nestorius*, recited in the fift Collation. We may not omit this, sayth he [r], that those lawes of *Theodosius* against *Nestorius*, *aliter se habere in Codice Theodosiano, are otherwise set downe both in the Code of Theodosius*, and in the Ephesine Councell, in which there is no mention at all of *Theodoret*, as in one of these there is: and then hee concludeth, *hæc de commentitiis scriptis, this may be spoken of the counterfeit writings inserted in these Acts*. Thus *Baronius*. I am somewhat ashamed that such a reason should slip from a Cardinall, specially from *Baronius*, for it bewrayes an exceeding imbecility of judgement. There is but one law extant in the Theodosian *Code* [t] against *Nestorius*, and the followers of his

[m] An. 554. nu. 8 *Exemplaria genuina mississe Hoscitur Gregorius.*

[n] *Germana exemplaria S. Synodi vidit & cognovit S. Gregorius. lib. 12. Epist. 7. Bin. pa. 607. a.*

[o] *S. Greg. lib 7. Epist 54. in depravata Synodi (quinta) exemplaria incidisse liquet, dum ait Ibam negasse dictam epistolam esse suam. Bar. an. 448. nu. 76.*

[p] *Obyt Greg. an. 604. Con. 6. habitum. an 681.*

[q] *Prefatos duos libros falsatos esse, eo quod neq; in unius episcopatu & immutilatis libris, ejusdem sancti Concilij, neque in chartaceo libro qui in vecenti inventus est apud bibliothecam venerabilis Patriarchy Act. 14. pa. 73. b*

[r] An. 553. nu. 46.

[t] Tit. de hæret. lib. 66. *Damnato*

his ſect. Now becauſe the lawes which are recited in the Synodall Acts [t] of this fift Councell, are different from it, hereupon the Cardinall preſently concludes it to be a forgery, an impoſture: he might as well conclude the Goſpell of S. *Luke*, or S. *Iohn* to bee forged, becauſe they differ from the Goſpels of *Matthew* and *Marke*: or the Booke of *Deuteronomy* to be forged, becauſe ſome lawes in *Exodus* are different from ſome in *Deuteronomy*. Is it poſſible, or credible, that *Baronius* could be ſo ſimple, and ſo infatuated, as to thinke one Emperour might not make divers lawes concerning one hereſie? ſpecially againſt divers perſons, or divers writings, though all of them ſupporting one hereſie? The law in the *Code* and theſe in the Acts are different lawes: True, they are ſo: but can the Cardinall prove, or doth he once offer to prove that they are one law? and that they ought not to differ? No: the Cardinall was wiſe enough not to undertake ſo hard a taske. For it is as evident as the Sun, that the law againſt *Neſtorius* which is in the *Code* was one, and firſt publiſhed; and long after that theſe which are recited in the Acts. In the one of theſe it is ſaid [u], *Iterum, igitur doctrina Diodori, & Theodori, & Neſtorij viſa eſt nobis abominanda, It ſeemes good to us againe to deteſt the doctrine of Diodorus, Theodorus, and Neſtorius.* This *Iterum*, imports it was once done before in a former law, and now in this the Emperour would doe the ſame again. As the lawes, ſo the occaſion of them, was quite different. That in the *Code* was made indeed againſt the hereſies of the Neſtorians, but in it none of them were perſonally & by name condemned, but only *Neſtorius*, all the reſt who favoured that hereſie, were in a generality, not by name condemned; becauſe when that law was made, the Neſtorians honoured, and held *Neſtorius* for their chiefeſt patron, and urged his writings: In theſe two recited in the Acts, *Diodorus* of *Tarſis*, *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia*, and their writings, are particularly, and by name condemned, as well as *Neſtorius*: and in the later the writings alſo of *Theodoret* againſt *Cyrill*: for when after that firſt law ſet downe in the *Code*, the Neſtorians durſt not, nor could without danger of puniſhment either praiſe *Neſtorius*, or reade, write, or urge his books, which were all by that law condemned: then they began to magnifie *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia*, and *Diodorus*, and the writing of *Theodoret*, all which were as plaine and plentifull for their hereſie, as *Neſtorius* himſelfe: but becauſe theſe were not as yet by name condemned, nor by name prohibited, they preſumed more boldly to rely on them. The Catholikes, and ſpecially they of Armenia, as is witneſſed [x] in a letter from them to *Proclus*, ſeeing this their new device, entreated the Emperor *Theodoſius* to ſtop that wicked courſe, & to condemne by name *Theodorus*, as well as hee had done *Neſtorius*. Which though at the firſt the Emperour did not, yet ſeeing how inſolent the Neſtorians grew upon thoſe writings, long after the former, he publiſhed theſe two, condemning now *explicitè* by name, and in particular, *Diodorus*, *Theodorus*, and the writing of *Theodoret*, which before were onely *implicitè*, and in a generality condemned. When the lawes, the occaſion, the time of promulgation, were all different, was not the Cardinall, thinke you, bereft of judgement, who would prove theſe later to bee

[t] *Coll. 5. pa. 544. & ſeq.*

[u] *Pa. 544. b.*

[x] *Coll. 5. pa. 542*

forged and counterfeit, becauſe they differ from the former, with which they ſhould not agree.

5. It maybe the Cardinall thought that all lawes were expreſſed in the *Code*, and therefore if there had beene any ſuch lawes as they, they would have beene there ſet downe. A conceit I beleeve which will never enter into any mans mind, while he hath uſe of his five wits, but into the Cardinals, who hath conceits by himſelfe, and knoweth notes above *Ela*. To ſay nothing of the twelve Tables, and of all the ancient Romane lawes, (no part of which are extant in the Theodoſian *Code*,) the moſt ancient law mentioned in the Gregorian, ſurpaſſeth not the time of the Emperour *Antoninus* [f]; and in the Theodoſian, not the time of *Conſtantine*. Can the Cardinall aſſure us that all the Lawes of *Conſtantine*, *Conſtantius*, and the other Emperours till the time of *Theodoſius* the younger, are expreſſed in this *Code*? *Euſebius* [u], and *Zozomen* [x] mention divers of *Conſtantines* lawes, *Pro liberatione exulum*, *Pro reducendis relegatis*, *Pro ijs qui ad metalla damnati erant*, *Pro confeſſoribus*, *Pro ingenuis*, *Quod Eccleſia ſit hæres ijs quibus nemo de ſanguine ſuperfuerit*; *De ſacellis, & cæmiteriis*, and many the like; none of which are in the Theodoſian *Code*; they were all publiſhed, if the Cardinall ſay [y] true, in the Conſulſhip of *Licinius*, the fift time, and *Criſpus*; for which yeare the Code hath no lawes, but two [z], one *De veteranis*, and another *De parricidio*.

6. To come yet nearer to the very times of *Theodoſius*: beſides all theſe, he made another Edict and law againſt *Neſtorius* [b], commanding if any Biſhop or Clerke mention that hereſie, that hee ſhould forthwith be depoſed; if a Laicke, bee anathematized; in which law hee particularly commandeth *Irenæus* Biſhop of *Tyrus* to be depoſed from his See. This law, though it is both recorded in the Acts of the Epheſine Councell, and confeſſed by the Cardinall [c] to bee truly the Emperours Law; yet is not extant in the *Code*, nor is it all one with that which is there ſet downe. The Cardinall by the ſame reaſon might prove it a forgery, as well as thoſe other two, and conclude the Acts of the Epheſine Councell to be falſified by Impoſtors, and ſo to be of no credit, as well as the Acts of this fift Synod. Further yet, there was another law againſt *Neſtorius* publiſhed by the ſame *Theodoſius* after the Epheſine latrociny, and recorded in the Acts of the Councell [d] at *Chalcedon*; wherein the Emperour ſhewes againe his deteſtation of that hereſie, approving the condemning and depoſing of *Domnus*, of *Theodoret* and *Irenie*, Neſtorian Biſhops, as alſo of *Flavianus*, and *Euſebius* of *Dorilen*, whom he thought to be Neſtorians: but therein the Emperour was miſ-informed, as hee had beene before, in the time of the holy Epheſine Synod, when upon like miſ-information hee condemned *Cyrill* and *Memnon*, as well as *Neſtorius*. That law, though acknowledged alſo by *Baronius* [e] to be true, is not extant in the Theodoſian *Code*, nor doth it accord with that which is there expreſſed: would not any man thinke it ridiculous hence to conclude as the Cardinall doth, that certainly it is therefore a forgery, and the Acts of Chalcedon containing ſuch forgeries, are to be held of no credit? Thus while the Cardinall labours to diſcredit theſe Acts, he ſo foully diſgraceth him

[f] *Nam* 1. *lex ibi poſita, eſt imperante Antonino & Severo.*
[t] *Vt liquet ex tit.* 1. *l.* 1.
[u] *Lib.* 2. *de vita Conſtant. ca.* 30. 31. *& ſeq.*
[x] *Lib.* 1. *ca.* 8.
[y] *an.* 318. *nu.* 37.
[z] *Vide Chronol. omnium Conſtit. Imperat. ſervata Conſulum ratione. extat poſt finem Codicis Theod.*
[b] *Extat illa lex tom.* 5. *Conc. Epheſ. ca.* 19.
[c] *An.* 448. *nu.* 2. *& ſeq.*
[d] *Act.* 3. *pa.* 85.
[e] *an.* 449. *n.* 130

himſelfe, that men may juſtly doubt whether hee were his owne man when he writ theſe things, which are ſo voide both of truth and reaſon.

CAP. XXXIII.

The third addition *to the Synodall Acts pretended by* Baronius, for that the Epiſtle of *Theodoret* written to *Neſtorius* after the union, is falſely inſerted, *refuted.*

1. THe third proofe which *Baronius* [a] brings to ſhew that theſe Acts are corrupted by the *additions* of ſome forged writings inſerted among them, is an Epiſtle of *Theodoret* written to *Neſtorius* after the union ſet downe in the fift Collation [b], wherein *Theodoret* profeſſeth to *Neſtorius*, that he did not receive the letters of *Cyrill* as orthodoxall; nay, hee ſheweth himſelfe ſo averſe from conſenting to them, and ſo addicted to *Neſtorius* after the union made; that hee thus writeth, *I ſay the truth unto you, I have often read them, and earneſtly examined them, and I have found them to be free,* (that is, full) *in uttering hereticall bitterneſſe; nor will I ever conſent to thoſe things which are unjuſtly done againſt you, nec ſi ambæ manus, no though both my hands ſhould bee cut off from me.* Thus writeth *Theodoret* in that Epiſtle which the holy Councell firſt, and after them we affirme and profeſſe to have beene the true writing of *Theodoret*; and the ſame to be a counterfeit, a forgery, and none of *Theodorets*, but framed by heretikes, *Baronius* confidently avoucheth.

a *Neſtoriani cõmentitias quaſdam Theodoreti ad Nouerre Epiſtolas, extat ex illis ad Neſtorium inſcripta ad finem 5. Actionis 5. Synodi. an. 436. nu. 10.*

b *Pa. 558. b.*

2. Now in this cauſe having the Synodall Acts, and with them the judgment of the whole generall approved Councell, on our ſide, wee might juſtly reject this as a calumny of *Baronius*, but for as much as hee not onely ſaith it, but undertakes to prove the ſame, wee will examine his reaſons, that ſo the integrity and credit of theſe Acts may be more conſpicuous. His reaſons are two. The firſt [c] is grounded on a teſtimony of *Leontius Scolaſticus*, who writeth [d] thus, *It is to bee knowne, that certaine letters of Theodoret and Neſtorius are caried about, in which either of them doe lovingly embrace the other, ſed fictitiæ ſunt, but they are counterfeit*, and deviſed by heretikes, thereby to oppugne the Councell at *Chalcedon*; but *Theodoret* hated *Neſtorius*, &c. Thus *Leontius*: and the Card. adds [e] this, *extat ex illis Epiſtolis una, one of thoſe counterfeit Epiſtles written to Neſtorius is extant in the fift Councell*, neare the end of the fift action thereof.

c Bar. loco cit.

d *Leont. lib. de ſect. Act. 4. extat tom. 4. Bibl. S. Patrum Edit. 3.*

e Bar. loco citato.

3. What if wee ſhould except againſt *Leontius*, (though hee [f] bee as ancient as Pope *Gregory*) as a man not of ſufficient credit? Or will the Card. thinke you, defend him, and take his teſtimony for ſound and good paiment? then farewell for ever the books of *Toby*, *Iudith*, *Wiſdome*,

f *Nam Leontius meminit Eulogij Epiſcopi Alexandrini, lib. de ſect. Act. 5. Gregorius vero et Eulogius æquales, et extat Epiſt. Greg. ad ipſum lib. 6. Epiſt. 37.*

Wiſdome, *Maccabees*, and *Eccleſiaſticus*; for *Leontius* [g] reckoning the bookes of the old Teſtament to be twenty two, and expreſly mentioning them all without theſe, ſaith, *Hi ſunt libri*, *theſe are the bookes*, as well of the old, as of the new Teſtament, which in the Church are held for Canonical. I doubt the Card. will here ſay, that the caſe is altered; In this hee ſpeaks againſt them and their *Trent* faith, not againſt us: Here the note of their *Index expurgatorius* [h] muſt bee embraced; write, ſaith the Index, in the margent, *diminutè Catalogum texuit Leontius*, *Leontius recites not fully the Catalogue of the ſacred bookes*: And yet note one memorable thing by the way; God who ſuffered not *Laban* to ſpeake an ill word againſt *Iacob*, and who turned the curſes of *Balaam* into a bleſſing to Iſraell, the ſame God over-ruled their pen or hands, as hee did once the tongue of *Caiphas*, and in ſtead of *diminutè texuit*, they have uttered a Prophecy againſt themſelves, printing even in that edition [i] which paſt through their Purgatorian fire of correction, *Divinitùs Catalogum librorum divinorum texuit*; *Leontius hath recited this Catalogue by an heavenly inſpiration*: and yet for all that *divinitus texuit*, the Cardinall will not beleeve *Leontius*, whom againſt us he perſwades all men to beleeve. But howſoever in other matters (as by name in that Catalogue *texto divinitus*) *Leontius* is to bee beleeved, of a certainty hee is no fit witneſſe in this cauſe of the *Three Chapters*; Hee was too partiall, that I ſay not hereticall, in this point, too much addicted to the writings of *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia*, and *Theodoret*; let *Baronius* himſelfe ſay, whether his commending of *Theodorus* [k] Biſhop of *Mopſveſtia*, and *Diodorus* Biſhop of *Tarſis*, for illuſtrating the whole Scripture by their Commentaries, for being ſuch worthy men, as that no man [l] while they lived, did reprove any one ſaying of theirs, bee not untrue, and after, both the perſon of the one, and writing of both condemned by the generall Councell, impious alſo and hereticall. To come yet nearer to his ſaying concerning *Theodoret*, in the very next ſentence ſave one before thoſe words which *Baronius* alleageth *Leontius* ſaith, *Verum ne Theodoretum quidem conſtat unquam admiſiſſe Neſtorium*, *it doth not appeare that Theodoret did ever admit of Neſtorius*, or hold communion with him. Had not the Cardinall skipt over (as is the wont of all heretikes) theſe former words of *Leontius*, hee would have beene aſhamed to alleage this teſtimony: For not onely the Synodall acts of the Epheſine [m] Councell, but the Cardinall himſelfe often teacheth and proveth it by cleare evidence, that *Theodoret* [n] admitted *Neſtorius*, and that into a neare band of friendſhip, love, and communion. In that Epiſtle which *Theodoret* writ from *Chalcedon* to *Alexander*, hee calleth *Neſtorius* their friend [o] τὸν ἐμὸν φίλον, and ſaith of him, while wee are here in this legacy to the Emperour, *non ceſſabimus omni virtute*, *ejus patris curam gerere*, wee will not ceaſe with all our power to take care for Father *Neſtorius*, knowing that wrong is done to him by wicked men. There is recorded [p] a very loving Epiſt. to *Neſtorius* written by *Iohn* & other Eaſtern Biſh. particularly by *Theodoret*, who all writ of themſelves *tui ſtudioſiſſimi*, we are all moſt affectionate to *Neſtorius*; of whom *Baronius* [q] ſaith, they who writ this to *Neſtorius*, *eidem intima conjuncti neceſſitudine*, *being joyned*

in

g Leont. Act. 2.
h Magiſter Sac. Palat. pa. 134. primi tom. Indicis Romæ editi, an. 1607.
i Edit. 3. Bibl. S. Patr. per Marg. la Bigne. Pariſ. an. 1610.
k Extiterunt iis temporibus duo viri, Diodorus et Theodorus Mopſveſtia, qui univerſas literas ſacras commentariis illuſtrabant. Leont. Act. 4.
l Nec ipſis vivis quiſquam dictis aliquod eorum reprehendebat. Ibid.
m Scripſi hæc præſentibus multis Epiſcopis, Archelao, Apringio, Theodoreto, &c. qui omnes tui ſtudioſiſſimi, una mecum te rogant, &c. ſic Iohan. Antio. Neſtorio. tom. 1. Conc. Eph. ca. 31
n Ex ſchola Theodori Mopſveſteni erant Neſtorius, Theodoretus et alij, fœtus viperini dicendi. Bar. an. 437. nu. 26. et Theodoretus ejuſdem planè communionis cum Theodoro Mopſveſteno, cujus adeo ſtudioſus extitit ut crederetur eum nomẽ Theodoreti à Theodoro derivaſſe. Ibid. nu. 29.
o De amico autem ſciat tua ſanctitas. (vult autem Neſtorium) Epiſt. Theodoret. tom. 3. Epheſ. Conc. Append. 2. ca. 9.
p Tom. 1. Eph. Conc. ca. 31.
q An. 431. nu. 44.

in a moſt neare band of familiarity, ſtood afterwards for him in the Councell, *Maximè vero eidem addictus Theodoretus*, but of *them all Theodoret was moſt addicted unto him*. And againe [r], having cited ſome words of *Theodoret*, he addeth, Seeing *Theodoret* ſaith thus, *Iam non ſolum cum Neſtorio unanimem fuiſſe vides, ſed dixerim etiam concorporeum*; *you ſee that he was not only a loving friend, and of one minde, but, if I may ſo ſay, one incorporated, and concorporated to Neſtorius*. Thus *Baronius*, when himſelfe ſo expreſly contradicts his owne witneſſe *Leontius*, and in this very cauſe touching *Theodoret* and *Neſtorius*, yea, in that which is the ground of *Leontius* errour touching this Epiſtle; ſhould hee require us to beleeve that which is but a collection from the former, which is his fundamentall errour? may *Baronius* reject him in the former clauſe, muſt we embrace him in the next, which is but a dependant on the other? *Leontius* becauſe hee thought, and thought erroniouſly, that *Theodoret* never embraced the friendſhip and communion with *Neſtorius*, thought alſo erroniouſly this Epiſtle (which teſtifieth *Theodorets* love and communion with *Neſtorius*) to bee a counterfeit; the Cardinall, who knoweth and profeſſeth againſt *Leontius*, that *Theodoret* was moſt inward, and even almoſt incorporated to *Neſtorius*, ought likewiſe to hold againſt *Leontius*, that this Epiſtle which teſtifieth ſuch ardent affection to *Neſtorius*, is the genuine and true *Epiſtle* of *Theodoret*.

[r] *An. tom. nu. 169*

4. And that every man may ſee the force of truth, and with what a feared conſcience the Cardinall dealt in this cauſe, behold himſelfe within few years after, againſt this teſtimony of *Leontius*, acknowledgeth, profeſſeth, and ſets downe this very *Epiſtle* as the true and certaine Epiſtle of *Theodoret* to *Neſtorius*, which here no doubt, againſt his owne judgement and conſcience hee denyeth, and proves out of *Leontius* not to bee the Epiſtle of *Theodoret*, but a counterfeit, and a forgery, for thus he writeth [s], *Theodoret indeed received the forme of faith ſent from Cyrill, (at the time of the union) and ſubſcribed unto it, but he could not ſo quickly forſake the friendſhip of Neſtorius, whom hee had ſo long affected, for at this time (to wit after the union was made) hee writ an Epiſtle to Neſtorius, which was read in the fift generall Synod*; and then repeating every word of the Inſcription and Epiſtle, hee adds at the end, *hactenus ad Neſtorium Theodoretus, thus writ Theodoret to Neſtorius*: and againe, *Theodoret obſtinately profeſſed in his letters lately recited, that hee would never aſſent to the ſentence againſt Neſtorius*. Thus *Baronius*; who hereby demonſtrates himſelfe to be a meere calumniator, who to diſgrace the Synodal Acts of the fift Councell, affirmes, and would ſeem by *Leontius* to prove that Epiſtle of *Theodorets* to bee none of his, but a forgery, which to bee no forgery but the true writing of *Theodoret*, himſelfe knew, teſtifieth and profeſſeth. Thus much of his former proofe out of *Leontius*.

[s] *An. 432. nu. 80 81. et ſeq.*

5. His other proofe is taken [t] out of divers Epiſtles of *Theodoret*, ſpecially out of that to *Dioſcorus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, to Pope *Leo*, and divers others; and becauſe it might bee replyed, that theſe were written long after the time of the *union*, whereas, onely at that time, and ſomewhat after, *Theodoret* might bee ſaid to have been hereticall,

[t] *Bar. an. 436. nu. 11.*

and

and a favourer of *Neſtorius*, as by this Epiſtle is ſignified: to wipe away this ſuſpition, he addes theſe words, *poſt initam quidem pacem, truly after the peace and union once made with Cyrill*, that ever after that time *Theodoret* was addicted to *Neſtorius*, *Nulla prorſus eſt mentio, there is no mention at all*; but there are many monuments, that (ſince then) *ſtrenuè atque impigrè laboravit, that he laboured ſtoutly and diligently for the Catholike faith.* To which purpoſe he againe ſaith[u], *Poſt reſtitutam Eccleſiæ pacem, after the peace and unity of the Church, Theodoret* by all Catholikes was knowne to bee orthodoxall, and to communicate with those that were orthodoxall. Which orthodoxy of faith, ſaith hee[x], thoſe Epiſtles of his doe ſo abundantly teſtifie, that by them *plus ſatis abſterſit, he hath too much wiped away*, purged and aboliſhed all the blots and blemiſhes which he had contracted by his acquaintance with *Neſtorius*. Thus *Baronius*, denying *Theodoret* at any time after the union made, to have beene hereticall, or a favourer of *Neſtorius*; and then undoubtedly this Epiſtle, which both is hereticall, and wherein ſuch entire love and affection is expreſſed to *Neſtorius*, and which is recorded to have beene written after the time of the union, can be none of *Theodorets*, but muſt be rejected for an impoſture, a forgery.

u an.449.n.140.

x an.436.nn.12

6. Doe you not verily beleeve the Cardinall had ſent his wit out of the Country, when hee writ that whole part of his Annals, which concernes theſe *three Chapters*? A little before he profeſſeth[y] this to be truly the Epiſtle of *Theodoret*, and now hee will prove that it was not, that it could not poſſible be the Epiſtle of *Theodoret*. Yea which is no leſſe worthy of obſerving, hee before not onely allowed this Epiſtle, (with the inſcription, wherein it was ſayd that it was writ to *Neſtorius* after the union) to be *Theodorets*; but he further ſayth[z], that *Theodoret* ſeemes to have beene of this minde, (which is noted in this Epiſtle) *etiam poſt concordiam*, even after the agreement, union, and concord made with *Cyrill*, ſeeing *Theodoret* ſo obſtinately profeſſeth in his letters, that hee would never aſſent to the ſentence againſt *Neſtorius*, *Sicque certum eſt aliquandiu perſeveraſſe, and ſo it is certaine that Theodoret continued ſome while* (after the union) *with an angry minde againſt Cyrill.* But now hee will prove the quite contrary, that *Theodoret* for a certainty writ no ſuch things, nor had any fellowſhip with *Neſtorius* after the union. So both it is certaine that *Theodoret* writ this, and yet it is certaine he writ it not; certaine that hee writ it after the union, and yet certaine that he writ it not after the union. That is, to ſpeake plainly, it is certaine the Cardinall demonſtrates himſelfe and his Annals to be falſe, untrue, and ridiculous, repugnant both to the truth, and to his owne writings.

y an.432.nn. 80,81.

z an.eod.nn.82.

7. This might ſuffice to oppoſe againſt whatſoever *Baronius* can produce. If he prove by any teſtimony this Epiſtle not to be *Theodorets*, I on the contrary will prove it to bee *Theodorets*, by the Cardinals owne teſtimony: If he prove by any reaſon *Theodoret* after the union not to have favoured *Neſtorius* and his hereſie; I on the contrary will prove that after the union hee favoured *Neſtorius*, by a ſtronger reaſon, even by the Cardinals owne confeſſion. If hee bring *Theodoret*, I bring *Baronius*, and ſo I might *Par pari referre, quod male*

male mordeat hominem. But beſides this confeſſion of *Baronius*, (which diſproves whatſoever he can prove againſt us in this matter) I will adde ſomewhat concerning thoſe Epiſtles of *Theodoret*, on which hee much relyeth. Thoſe Epiſtles comming out of the [a] Vaticane (the very *Mint-houſe* of forgery) are in truth nothing elſe but counterfeits, as hereafter I purpoſe more fully to demonſtrate; for this time I will onely mention that which moſt concernes this preſent cauſe, out of thoſe Epiſtles which the Cardinall moſt urgeth, and thoſe are his Epiſtles to *Dioſcorus*, & to Pope *Leo*, ſpecially ſeeing that to *Dioſcorus* (as the Cardinall [b] tels us) declareth the faith of *Theodoret* to bee ſuch and ſo orthodoxal, that it is enough, *ad abſtergendum ſuſpitionem, to wipe away all ſuſpition of hereſie*, wherewith, by reaſon of ſome counterfeit writings in the Synod, (I thinke he meanes the fift Councell) hee was blamed: And indeed in thoſe Epiſtles there is a plain condemning of the hereſies of *Neſtorius*; but firſt thoſe Epiſt. were writ long after [c] the *union*, and ſo cannot helpe the Cardinall at all in this point: and if they had beene writ preſently upon that *union*, yet thoſe not to bee truely *Theodorets*, divers circumſtances doe make evident. In the Epiſtle to *Dioſcorus* * *Theodoret* is made to relate how long before that time hee had beene a Biſhop, and where hee had preached. The yeares of his Biſhopricke he reckons [d] to bee twenty ſix, all which time he continued a Preacher at *Antioch*. Whence *Baronius* [e] obſerveth, *Theodoretum Epiſcopum publicum ſemper egiſſe Catechiſtam Antiochiæ, that Theodoret being a Biſhop, was continually the publike Catechiſt at Antioch*, during that time of three Patriarchs, *Theodatus*, *Iohn*, and *Domnus*: And at leaſt it might bee ſuppoſed that hee was a Preacher, or (as the Cardinall cals him) a Catechiſer in that City, before hee was Biſhop; another of thoſe Epiſtles (that *ad Nonium* [f]) wil aſſure us the contrary, for there *Theodoret* ſaith of himſelfe, I ſtayed in a Monaſtery, *quouſque Epiſcopus factus, till I was made a Biſhop*; And *Baronius* [g] further explanes this, ſaying, *creatus Epiſcopus*, after *Theodoret* was made and ordained Biſhop, he was held at *Antioch* to be the preacher there, firſt by *Theodatus*, then by *Iohn* his ſucceſſor: *Theodoret* goes on to ſet forth his owne orthodoxy and praiſe, ſaying [h], *that though hee ſo long continued a preacher at Antioch, yet in all thoſe yeares, neither* [i] *any of the Biſhops, nor any of the Clergy did reprove his doctrine or ſayings*; which hee explanes in that other Epiſtle [k] to Pope *Leo*, ſaying thus, *Whereas I have beene a Biſhop theſe ſixe and twenty yeares*, yet in all this time, *non ſubij quantumvis levem reprehenſionem, I have not beene ſo much as lightly reproved for my doctrine, but by the favor of God I have delivered more than* 1000 (or as *Baronius* [l] corrects it, more than ten thouſand) *ſoules from Marcioniſme, Arianiſme, Eunomianiſme, ſo that in eight hundred Pariſhes* (*ſo many are in my Dioceſſe of* Cyrus) *there hath not remained no not one weede, but my flocke is free from all hereticall errour.* Thus hee in that Epiſtle. Which his orthodoxy hee yet more fully declares in another Epiſtle [m]; *Looke on my writings both before and ſince the holy Epheſine Councell, in ſingulis quæ edidimus operibus, Eccleſiæ ſanus ſenſus & mens mihi conſpicitur; in all and every one of my writings, the doctrine of the Church, and my ſound*

a *Epiſtolas Theodoreti* (157. numero) *Græcè ſcriptas continet codex Vaticanus, &c.* Bar. an. 430. nu. 48.

b *An.* 444. nu. 20.

c *Epiſtola ad Leonem ſcripta erat poſt Epheſinum Latrocinium illud habitum an.* 449. *altera ad Dioſcorum ſcripta eſt an.* 444 *ut ait Bar. ille an. nu.* 18. *at unio facta eſt an.* 432. Bar. *ille an. nu.* 72.

* *Extat apud Bar. an.* 444. nu. 21.

d *Sex annos ibi ego docens tempore Theodoſij, alios tredecim annos tempore Johannis, præter hæc jam ſeptimus agitur annus quo Domnus ſedet. Epiſt. Theod. apud Bar. an* 444. nu. 23.

e *Ibidem.*

f *Extat apud Bar. an.* 448. nu. 12. *et ſeq.*

g *An.* 423. nu. 10.

h *Epiſt. ad Dioſcorum apud Bar. an.* 444. nu.

i *Et uſque hodie cum tantum tempus præterierit nullius neq; Deo dilectorum Epiſcoporum, neque pyſſimorũ Cleericorum, ea quæ à me dicta ſunt, reprehendi aliquando. Ibid.*

k *Epiſt. Theod.* 113. *extat apud Bar. an.* 449. nu. 115.

l *An.* 424. nu. 19.

m *Epiſt. Theodoreti* 81. *ad Euſebium Ancyræ Epiſcopum apud Bar an.* 443. nu. 131.

opinion

opinion is conſpicuous: And againe in that to *Nomus* [n] ſpeaking of the ſame his integrity of faith, in all theſe five and twenty yeares, ſaith he, *Nec à quoquam accuſatus, nec quenquam accuſavi, Neither have I beene accuſed of any man, neither have I accuſed any.* Thus is *Theodoret* made to write in thoſe Epiſtles.

8. Let us omit the vanity and folly of the forgerer, who reports this as an honour to *Theodoret*, that hee even when hee was a Biſhop, was a Catechiſer for ſix and twenty yeares together, and that out of his owne Dioceſſe: that withall hee makes *Theodoret* boaſt of a moſt unlikely matter, that by his care and diligence (even during that his abſence) he had ſo rooted all weeds of hereſie out of his owne Dioceſſe, that *ne unum zizanium, not ſo much as one weed remained,* in all thoſe eight hundred Pariſhes whereof he was Paſtor. Doe but obſerve here two moſt palpable and ridiculous untruths of the forgerer. The former, that he makes *Theodoret* to write in the firſt yeare of *Dioſcorus*, that is, as *Baronius* [o] aſſures us, *an.* 444. that hee had then beene a Biſhop ſix and twenty yeares. Now hee was created Biſhop, as the Cardinall [p] demonſtrates, and ſets downe for a certainty, *An.* 423. to which if you adde 26. I doubt not but any Arithmetician will eaſily ſhew it to be impoſſible that at the yeare 444. he ſhall be 26. yeares a Biſhop. Nay ſee and deride the folly of this impoſtor. In the Epiſtle to *Leo* written after [q] the Epheſine Latrociny, which the Cardinall [r], *Binius* [s], and all confeſſe to have beene *An.* 449. he makes *Theodoret*, account the whole time of his Biſhopricke, to bee but twenty [t] ſixe yeares, which was ſo much when hee writ to *Dioſcorus*, five yeares before that.

9. And here withall note by the way the rare wiſedome of Cardinall *Baronius*. He upon that Epiſtle [u] to *Dioſcorus* ſets downe this Memorandum, *Obſerva lector*, Note here gentle reader, that all theſe twenty ſix yeares Biſhop *Theodoret* was a Catechiſt; and withall note how long each of thoſe three Patriarches ſate (to wit, ſix and twenty yeares) from the time that *Theodoret* was made Biſhop, till this yeare 444. *Obſerva lector*, Note againe good reader, the dotage of the Cardinall. *Theodoret* was made Biſhop *An.* 423. and by adding 26. the Cardinall cannot finde above 444. Truly it was fit he ſhould be beſotted, who undertakes to defend Impoſtours, and moſt ſottiſh untruths. But in the meane ſpace doe you not thinke *Baronius* a very fit man to write Annals of 1200. yeares, that is ſo exact in calculating ſo ſmall a ſumme, as to account 23. and 26. to make juſt 44. though at another time, when by ſuch a falſe accompt he had no purpoſe to diſgrace or refute the Acts of this Synod, he [x] could then ſumme thoſe particulars to make 49.

10. The other untruth which I mentioned is common to both theſe Epiſtles, and demonſtrates them both to be counterfeits, or *Theodoret* if he writ them to be a moſt ſhameleſſe lyer, and in theſe his writings of no credit at all. In all thoſe 25. or 26. yeares, ſaith he, I was not accuſed, nor reproved: no not lightly reproved for my doctrine by any man. Not accuſed? not reproved? no not lightly reproved? Fye, both he and his doctrines were condemned and accurſed for hereti-

call,

n *Theodor. Epiſt.* 81. *apud Bar. an.* 448. *nu.* 14.

o *An.* 444. *nu.* 18. *Defuncto Cyrillo, ſuffectus eſt hoc anno in locũ ipſius Dioſcorus.*

p *Hoc eodem anno Theodoretus Cyri creatus eſt Epiſcopus; id plane colliges ex &c. Bar. an.* 423. *nu.* 10.

q *Nam in ea Epiſt.* (*quæ eſt Theod.* 113.) *narrat ſe injuſte in eo Concilio Epheſino depoſitum. apud Bar. an.* 444. *nu.* 118.

r *Non hoc an.* (448.) *ſed ſequenti Epheſi famoſam habitam eſſe Synodũ, certum eſt. Bar. an.* 448 *nu.* 58.

s *In Notis ſuis ad Conciliab. Epheſ. pa.* 1017. *b.*

t *Viginti ſex annis Eccleſiam rexi. Epiſt. Theod. ad Leonem apud Bar. an.* 449. *nu.* 119. *quos ab an.* 423. *inchoandos eſſe neceſſario ſtatuit pro certo. Bar. an.* 423. *nu.* 10.

u *an.* 444. *nu.* 23

x *Cum Theodoretus teſtatur ſe anno* 449. *habere in ſede Epiſcopali annos* 26. *utique in hunc annum* (423.) *neceſſe eſt revoces ſedis ejus primordia. Bar. an.* 423. *nu.* 10.

call, and before hee writ this to *Leo*, himſelfe was depoſed alſo from his Biſhoprick in a generall Councell. Of all which there are undoubted evidences as cleare as the Sun. His impious and hereticall writings againſt *Cyrill*, and his twelve Chapters, ſo often recorded both in the fift Councell, in the Imperiall Edict of *Iuſtinian*, in Pope *Gregory* and *Pelagius*, acknowledged by *Baronius* for impious and heretical, theſe being writ in the time of the holy Epheſine Councell directly in defence of Neſtorianiſme, and againſt the Catholike faith, did the doctrine of the Church ſhine in them? were not they reproved? not ſo much as lightly reproved? when the holy Epheſine Councell [y] expreſly condemned and accurſed all the doctrines of *Neſtorius*, and all who defend them: was this thinke you no reproofe of *Theodoret* his writings? There is extant among the acts of the Epheſine Councell, the decree which *Iohn* [a] Biſhop of Antioch made with the reſt that tooke part with *Neſtorius*, and which falſely called themſelves the holy Synod of *Epheſus*, whereas they were nothing elſe but a meere conſpiracy of deteſtable heretikes. In that decree they depoſe *Cyrill* and *Memnon* as being Apollinarians, heretikes, contemners of the holy Fathers and their doctrine, turbulent, ſeditious, and the like: they accurſe all the reſt of the Biſhops who conſented to *Cyrill*, that is, all who were of the holy Epheſine Councell; and they binde them with an *Anathema* ſo long, till they did accurſe the twelve chapters of *Cyrill*, (that is, till they did renounce and accuſe the Catholike faith, and maintaine Neſtorianiſme.) To this hereticall, falſe, ſlanderous, and diabolicall decree of the Neſtorians, *Theodoret* ſubſcribed by name among the reſt. What thinke you now? Did *Theodoret* all this time accuſe none? or was this decree to which he ſubſcribed not accuſed? was it not reproved, not lightly reproved of any? Reade but the ſeventh Chapter of the fourth Tome of thoſe acts [b], and there you ſhall ſee that this their whole conventicle, and among the reſt *Theodoret* is particularly condemned, and anathematized by the holy Oecumenicall Synod of *Epheſus*, for this their hereticall dealing: and I ſuppoſe this was ſome reproofe of *Theodoret*, to bee, and that moſt juſtly, condemned and excommunicated for an heretike by the conſenting judgment of an holy Oecumenicall Synod; that is in truth by the whole Catholike Church. Thoſe Acts of the Epheſine Councell containe 1000. like demonſtrations of that untruth, uttered in thoſe Epiſtles. Among them all conſider but that Sermon [c] which *Theodoret* made to the Neſtorians at *Chalcedon*, during the time of that Epheſine Councell, of which *Peltanus* ſayth, *Theodoret* is caryed, *inſano impitu*, with a furious rage againſt *Cyrill*, and the other Orthodoxall Biſhops of the holy Councell, comparing them to Serpents, Baſiliskes, murderers, and the like. Neither doth he onely vomit out his choler againſt them, but he plainly girded at the Emperour alſo. (Did he accuſe none when he uttered all this?) Nay he [d] affirmes Catholikes which hold Chriſt God and man to be one perſon, and ſo to be paſſible, to be worſe than Heathens. The Heathens, ſayth he, taught, the Heaven, the Sun, and the Starres to be impaſſible, and ſhall wee beleeve the onely begotten Son of God to be paſſible, and ſuch as may dye? *Abſit Salvator, ne ſic ſimus*

y *Sancta Synodus, variſe ſententia condemnavit eliorum vaniloquentiam, quotquot vel poſt Neſtorium, vel certe illum fuere qui eadem ſapuerent.* Append. 1. ad tom. 2. Act. Epheſ. Conc. ca. 6 pa. 679.

a Tom. 3. Act. Eph. Conc. ca. 2. pa. 775.

b Pa. 737.

c Append. 5. ca. 3. ad tom 6. Act. Conc. Eph. p. 907

d Theod. loc. cit.

ſimus Apoſtatæ; farre be this from us, O Saviour, let us not be ſuch Apoſtates, as to teach this, let us not ſuſpect that our Saviour could ſuffer. Let any man now judge whether it be not a ſhameleſſe untruth which thoſe Epiſtles avouch that *Theodoret* was not reproved for this doctrine, no not lightly reproved in all thoſe 26. yeares; whereas both then and ever ſince, the whole Catholike Church hath accurſed his impiety and hereſie, which he ſo inſolently then preached? And omitting infinite like proofes of the falſhood of that Epiſtle, the next yeare after the Epheſine Councell, there was a Synod [e] held at Antioch, where *Iohn* and divers other Biſhops concluded the full *union* with *Cyrill*, wherein they all condemne & anathematize the hereſies of *Neſtorius*, which their profeſſion of faith, and this condemning of the Neſtorian hereſie, *Iohn* ſent, both to *Cyrill*, to Pope *Sixtus*, and to *Maximianus* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*. Now ſeeing *Theodoret* not onely in former time had beene ſo violent and furious in defence of that doctrine, but then and long after continued in the ſame minde, was not his doctrine reproved, nay was it not accurſed and anathematized by *Iohn* Patriarch of *Antioch*, and many other Biſhops ſubject to his Patriarchſhip? What a moſt vile and ſhameleſs untruth then is it, which the Impoſtor makes *Theodoret* to utter, that in the whole ſpace of 25. or 26. yeares he neither accuſed any, nor was accuſed nor reproved, no not lightly reproved either by *Iohn* or any other, but that all and every one of his writings, contained the true doctrine of the Church? But enough of thoſe Epiſtles, which to be forged and falſe this which is already ſayd may for this time ſuffice.

[e] *Tom. 5. Act. Eph. Conc. ca. 5. pa. 831. & pa. 927.*

11. Having now declared how untrue that is which *Baronius* affirmeth, that *Theodoret* after the *union* did never embrace the hereſies of *Neſtorius*, and withall ſeene how weake and unſound his proofe is in this point, I will yet adde one conſideration which will further manifeſt, and even demonſtrate the ſame. That is taken from the hiſtory of *Theodoret*. Certaine it is, that when *Theodoret* writ that hiſtory, he was earneſtly addicted to Neſtorianiſme, whereof in the very laſt Chapter [f] he gives an eminent proofe, commending *Theodorus* Biſhop of *Mopſveſtia* for a worthy teacher of the whole Church, and for an oppugner of all hereſies: adding, that whereas he was a Biſhop thirty ſix yeares, he never ceaſed, *optimam herbam ſanctis Chriſti ovibus ſuppeditare, to feed the flocke of Chriſt with the beſt herbes*. None can doubt but hee who ſo much extolleth ſo deteſtable an heretike, and approveth thoſe moſt damnable hereſies which from him *Neſtorius* ſuckt, for the beſt herbes or doctrines, but he muſt needs be confeſſed to bee as deepe in Neſtorianiſme as *Neſtorius* himſelfe. If now it may appeare that this hiſtory was writ by him after the union, there can no doubt remaine but that after the union *Theodoret* favoured *Neſtorius* and all his hereſies.

[f] *Lib. 5. ca. 40.*

12. *Baronius* knowing this inevitably to follow, to decline the whole force of this, tels [g] us that *Theodoret writ his hiſtory not onely before the union, but before the jarre alſo; yea before the time of the holy Councell at Epheſus; whereof having given ſome ſleight conjectures, in the end he concludes, Dicendum eſt, It muſt be ſayd that Theodoret writ this hiſtory in the*

[g] *An. 427. nu. 28*

the ſpace of thoſe three yeares which were next precedent to the holy Epheſine Councell. So he. Shall I ſay the Cardinall was deceived and overſeene herein? No, I will not ſuſpect that ſuch an evident error could creepe into the minde of ſo exact an Annaliſt. I rather thinke his intent was, wilfully and wittingly to deceive others, and that therefore hee ſayd this to ſmother that truth touching *Theodorets* continuance in Neſtorianiſme, which he elſewhere ſo often denieth. *Theodoret* [h] mentioneth in that his hiſtory the tranſlation of the body or reliques of *Chryſoſtome*, and bringing them to *Conſtantinople*. The Cardinall was ſo far from being ignorant hereof, that himſelfe citeth [i] *Theodoret* with a *memorandum*, He, *ante omnes*, above them all mentioneth this tranſlation, but in few words. That tranſlation, as *Socrates* [k] and *Marcellinus* [l] witneſſe, was when *Theodoſius* was the ſixteenth time Conſull, that is, as the Cardinall alſo accounteth, in the yeare 438. Now ſeeing the union betweene *Iohn* and *Cyrill* was made in the yeare 432. it unavoydably followeth, that either *Theodoret* writ not his Hiſtory till ſeven yeares at leaſt after the union, and how much more I know not, whether 8. 10. or 16. after it; (for it is uncertaine:) or if hee writ it, as the Cardinall divineth, before the Epheſine Synod, that he writ it prophetically, writing thoſe Acts which happened not till eight or nine yeares after his hiſtory was written. The truth is, an orderly and hiſtoricall continuation of things done, he doth not write, but onely to the death of *Theodorus* Biſhop of *Mopſveſtia*, where his hiſtory (for any ſuch continuation of ſucceeding matters) doth end: but to ſhew and teſtifie that he writ his hiſtory after the yeare 438. hee purpoſely mentioneth ſome of thoſe acts which fell out in that yeare: and hereof further there may be a preſumption, becauſe *Theodoret*, as *Baronius* tels [m] us, followed *Sozomen* in his commending of *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia*; now *Sozomens* hiſtory was continued unto the 17. Conſulſhip of *Theodoſius*, as himſelfe witneſſeth: So that if *Theodoret*, as the Cardinall tels us, tooke it out of *Sozomen*, and his booke was not publiſhed till the yeare 439. ſure the Cardinall of all men had reaſon to think that *Theodoret* could not before that time (otherwiſe than prophetically in this point) write his hiſtory. It remaineth now, ſeeing *Theodoret* was an earneſt defender of *Neſtorius* at the time when he writ this hiſtory; and it was written after the yeare 438. that out of all doubt till then hee remained hereticall, and devoted to all the blaſphemies and hereſies of *Neſtorius* and *Theodorus*, which in that hiſtory he commends for moſt wholſome food, and Catholike doctrine.

h *Lib.5.hiſt. Eccl.ca.36.*

i *Bar.an.438. nu.6.*

k *Lib.7.ca.44.*

l *In ſuo Chron.*

m *Ecquid mirum, ſi quod dixerat Sozomenus, à Theodoreto repetitum inveniatur. Bar. in Martyr. Rom. Decemb.23.*

11. But not to ſtay longer in a matter very cleare, my concluſion of this former point is this; Seeing the Cardinall tels us that from the time of the union *Theodoret* was not onely a Catholike and orthodoxall Biſhop, but that he did manfully fight for the Catholike faith, it evidently followeth, that in the Cardinals judgment, Neſtorianiſm and thoſe herbes, nay moſt poyſonfull weeds of *Theodorus* are Catholike doctrines, ſeeing as now we have proved for many (but of a certainty for ſeven yeares at leaſt) after the *union*, that doctrine which *Theodoret* embraced, and ſo earneſtly defended, was no other than the

blaſphemous hereſies of *Neſtorius* and *Theodorus*. And let this ſuffice for the third *addition*, which he unjuſtly objecteth to the Acts of this fift Councell.

CAP. XXXIV.

The fourth addition *to the Synodall Acts, pretended by Baronius*, for that the Epiſtle of *Theodoret*, intitled to *Iohn* Biſhop of Antioch, is falſly inſerted therein; *refuted.*

1. THis fourth inſtance concernes an Epiſtle of *Theodoret*, inſcribed to *Iohn* Biſhop of *Antioch*, ſet downe neare the laſt end of the fift Collation; wherein *Theodoret* exceedingly rejoyceth for the death of *Cyrill*. In handling whereof, *Baronius* and *Binius* doe more than triumph, as if the field were certainly wonne. That Epiſtle, ſayth *Binius* [a], *nequiſſimi & ſceleſtiſſimi alicujus nebulonis Eutychiani commentum eſt, is the forgery of ſome moſt naughty and nefarious Eutychian varlet*, and by fraud and ſurreption is thruſt into the Acts of this Synod. We have before diſcovered, ſaith *Baronius* [b], the impoſture of that Epiſtle, but we are not grieved to repeat the ſame things here againe, that it may be ſhewed that they are not the true Acts of the Synod, *ſed nebulonis cujuſdam ex cogitatione commentum, but a forgery deviſed by ſome knave:* and therfore we ſay, that Epiſtle which is recited under the name of *Theodoret* to *Iohn* of Antioch, *Omni ex parte convinci, is every way convinced not to bee Theodorets.* Againe [c], *There is an Epiſtle ſet downe in the fift Synod, under the name of Theodoret, written unto Iohn, rejoycing in the death of Cyrill, and babbling very many things againſt him, which you may more truly call a Satyre, or infamous libell, than an Epiſtle. And we take it very indignely that it ſhould goe under the name of Theodoret, which is rather the figment of ſome Neſtorian:* and againe [d], it is *figmentum impudentiſſimi cujuſdam nebulonis*, a fiction of ſome moſt ſhameles varlet. Thus & much more *Baronius*. The like doth *Binius* with no leſſe confidence and virulency againſt theſe Acts affirme. The maine ground on which they both relye, is, for that *Iohn* Biſhop of *Antioch* to whom this Epiſtle is inſcribed, was dead before *Cyrill*. How could *Theodoret*, ſaith *Baronius* [e], write to *Iohn* touching the death of *Cyrill*, ſeeing *Iohn* was dead ſeven yeares before *Cyrill*? which, ſaith he, *exploratum habetur*, is ſure and certaine, both by *Nicephorus* and others who writ the ſucceſſion of Biſhops, as alſo by an Epiſtle which *Cyrill* writ to *Domnus* the ſucceſſour of *Iohn*, both which proofes *Binius* [f] alſo alledgeth.

a *Annot. in 5. Concil §. Conſtitutum.*

b *an. 553. nu. 43*

c *Bar. an. 444. nu. 12.*

d *an. 553. n. 44.*

e *an. 444. nu. 16 & an. 553. n. 44.*

f *Loco citato.*

2. My firſt anſwer hereunto is, that if this bee a demonſtration of forgery, becauſe an Epiſtle is written to one that is dead, themſelves, and not we, ſhall be the greateſt loſers hereby. There is a decretall Epiſtle [g] written by Pope *Clement* to *Iames* Biſhop of *Ieruſalem*, and bro-

g *Epiſt. 1. Clem. extat. to. 1. Conc. pa. 25. & ſeq.*

brother of our Lord: in that Epiſtle the Pope tels *Iames*, how *Peter* being now ready to bee martyred, tooke *Clement*, ordained him Biſhop, gave him the keyes, ſet him in his owne chayre, and when hee was ſet therein, ſayd unto him, *Deprecor te O Clemens, O Clement I beſeech thee* before all that are here preſent, that thou write unto *Iames* the brother of our Lord, how thou haſt beene a companion with me of my journyes, and of my actions, *ab initio uſque ad finem, from the beginning to the end*; and write alſo what thou haſt heard mee preach in every City, what order of words, of actions, I have uſed in my preaching, and alſo what an end I make of my life in this City. Neither feare that he will be ſory for my death, ſeeing he will not doubt but I dye for pieties ſake; yea it will be a great comfort unto him, to heare that I doe not leave my charge to one that is ignorant or unlearned. According to this requeſt and command of *Peter*, *Clement* writ an Epiſtle to *Iames*, exhorting him, that he command all that which *Peter* taught, to be diligently obſerved. This and much more writ *Clement* to *Iames* after the death, and of the life and death of *Peter*. Now *Iames* unto whom hee writ was dead ſixe or ſeven yeares before *Peter*: For *Iames* was ſlaine in the ſeventh, and *Peter* in the thirteenth yeare of *Nero*, as out of S. *Ierome* [h], *Euſebius* [i], *Ioſephus* [k], and others, is evident; and as *Baronius* [l], and after him *Binius* [m], not onely profeſſe but clearly and rightly prove: and becauſe this is a decretall [n] Epiſtle, an *Apoſtolicall* [o] writing, ſent from *Clement* being Pope, which was not till the tenth [p] yeare of *Domitian*, and that is thirty yeares after the [q] death of *Iames*, it hence enſueth that it was writ to *Iames* thirty yeares after he was dead. What ſhall now become of this decretall and *Apoſtolicall* Epiſtle? Will they be content that by the Cardinals demonſtration it bee rejected as the forgery of ſome leud varlet? Fye! By no meanes. *Binius* [r] cals it the Epiſtle of Pope *Clement*; *Baronius* [s] tels us that it is not only Pope *Clements*, but that this and the other written to the ſame *Iames* the dead Biſhop of *Ieruſalem*, are *integræ & illibatæ, intire and incorrupted writings of Clement*. In their Canon law [t], and that corrected by the Pope, it is ſtiled the epiſtle of Pope *Clement* to *Iames*: and that which is there related muſt ſtand for the words and doctrine of S. *Peter* [u]; yea the authority of it, as other decretall Epiſtles, *Conciliorũ* [x] *Canonibus pari jure exæquatur*, is every way equall to the Canons of *Nice*, of *Chalcedon*, of other holy Councels. If that bee too little, what Saint *Auſten* [y] ſayth of the very ſacred Canonicall Scriptures, indited by the Spirit of God himſelfe, that doth *Gratian* (wretchedly abuſing Saint *Auſtens* words) apply to this and the reſt of the Popes decretall Epiſtles, ſaying of them [z], *Inter Canonicas Scripturas, decretales Epiſtolæ connumerantur*; *the decretall Epiſtles are to be reckoned among the Canonicall Scriptures*. *Bellarmine* [a] not onely in generall defends this ſaying of *Gratian*, telling us that the decretals may well be called Canonicall, that is, either ſuch as are a rule, and have force to binde; or Canonicall in that ſenſe as the ſeventh Synod calleth the Decrees of Councels, *Conſtitutions* inſpired from God; but particularly alſo

h *Hic Iacobus 30. annis rexit Eccleſiam, uſq; ad ſeptimum Neronis annum. Hier. in Catal. ſcrip. in Iacobo. Petrus ad ultimum annum Neronis, id eſt, 14. Eccleſiam rexit. idem in Petro.*

i *Euſeb. an. 7. Neronis ait Iacobum occiſum. an. Chriſt. 63. Petrus an. 14. Neronis idem an. 70.*

k *Ioſeph. Iacobũ lapidatũ ait an. poſt Chriſtum natum 63. Antiqu. lib. 20. c. 8.*

l *Anno 7. Neronis, Iacobi necem accidiſſe omnes conſentiunt. Bar. an. 63. nu. 2. Petrum autem anno 13. Neronis occiſum probat. Bar. an. 69. nu. 2.*

m *Annot. in Epiſt. 1. Clem.*

n *Inter Decretales epiſtolas Pontificum numerat eam Turrian. lib. 2. ca. 13. & hoc probat. p. 109*

o *Apoſtolicorum Pontificum. Tur. lib. 2. in præf. pa. 150. et ſuis authoribus, id eſt Apoſtolicis, dignißimas. ibid. pa. 152.*

p *Clementem ingreſſum in Papatum an. Chr. 93. is eſt Domitiani an. 10. probat Baron. an. 93. nu. 2.*

q *Nam is obijt (ut probatum eſt) an. Chr. 63.*

r *Epiſtola 1. Clement. Pape.*

ſ *An. 102. nu. 6.*

t *Clemens Papa;*

ad Iacobum Epiſt. 1. Diſtinct. 80. ca. 2. ſic iterum Cauſ. 6. q. 1. ca. 5. u *Petrus in ordinatione Clementis: cauſ. 11. q. 3. ca. 12. attendite ſermoni illius, qui nobis per B. Clementẽ recitatur. Nich. 1. Epiſt. 49. et beatus Petrus prohibebat. Cauſ. 6. q. 1. ca. 5.*

x *Diſt. 20. ca. Decretales.* y *Lib. 2. de doct. Chriſt. ca. 8.* z *Diſt. 19. ca. 6.* a *Lib. 2. Conc. ca. 12.*

he defends [b] by the authority of *Ruffinus* this to be the true Epiſtle of Pope *Clement* unto *Iames*: and to omit others, their Ieſuite *Turrian*, to whom *Baronius* [c], *Binius* [d], *Gretzer* [e], and others, refer us for the credit of theſe Epiſtles, hath writ a whole booke in defence of them; wherein he cals them (and particularly he mentioneth and defendeth this of *Clement* to *Iames*) *ſanctiſſimas* [f], *veriſimas*, *&c. moſt holy, moſt true Epiſtles*, moſt worthy of their authors; that is, men Apoſtolike, conſecrated by the reverence of the whole world, full [g] of all gravity, learning and ſanctity, confirmed by the teſtimony and uſe of all ages: and which is moſt worthy remembring for our preſent purpoſe, the Ieſuite writes in defence of them thus [h], *What if in theſe Epiſtles ſometimes there meet us ſome ſuch matters as are not eaſie to all? muſt wee therefore doubt of their authority? by no meanes.* Therefore if any man doe not underſtand how the Epiſtle of *Clement* could bee written to *Iames* the brother of our Lord, who was dead more than eight yeares before, ſuch an one, if he be a learned, modeſt, and temperate man, he will ask of others, and in the meane ſpace containe himſelfe within his owne bounds; that is, as himſelfe explaineth, handling this Epiſtle [i], he muſt ſo firmly hold it to be written by Pope *Clement*, *ut dubitare nefas exiſtimet, that he eſteeme it a great ſinne to doubt thereof.* Beſides all this, the Ieſuite hath a large Chapter [k] purpoſely to defend and ſhew this Epiſtle to be truly *Clements*, though it was written to *Iames* long after he was dead. Some there were (whom *Baronius* [l], *Poſſevine* and *Binius* follow) who thought it was written indeed by *Clement*, but not unto *Iames*, who was then dead, but unto his ſucceſſor *Simeon*. Againſt theſe their owne *Turrian* holds reſolutely [p] that it was writ not to *Simeon*, nor to any but to *Iames*; and whereas ſome would think it a folly [q] and madneſſe to write to ſuch an one as was dead, and which was knowne to be dead to the author who writ it, (for who ſhould be the carier of this letter unto him?) eſpecially to write unto him as a governour in the Church militant, & to inſtruct and exhort [r] him what he ſhould carefully obſerve, *Turrian* tels [s] you that there were divers great and waighty reaſons why Saint *Peter* commanded *Clement*, and why *Clement* did write this to a dead man, whom they both knew to be dead: and having given divers very wiſe and worthy reaſons hereof, one taken from transfiguration [u], another [x] from imitation, a third from avoyding [y] hatred, if he had writ to any that had beene alive; a fourth [z], for to be a teſtimony of the Reſurrection, (belike becauſe that Saint *Iames* ſhall then reade this holy Apoſtolicall Epiſtle, and ſee what

b *Ruffinus meminit epiſtolæ Clementis ad Iacobum, et eam ſe vertiſſe dixit ex Græco.* Bell. lib. 2. de Pont. Rom. ca. 14. §. *Ad hæc.*

c *Tu conſule Turrianum.* Bar. an. 102. nu. 6.

d *Cujus fidei ſint hæ Clementis epiſtolæ, Vide Turrianum.* Bin. notis in Epiſt. 1. Clem. pa. 31.

e Defenſ. ca. 14 lib. 2. de Pont. Rom. §. Altera.

f Turr. pro epiſt. Pontificum. lib. 2. præf. pa. 152.

g *Omni gravitate, doctrinâ et ſanctitate refertas, ibid.*

h Præf. eadem. pa. 150. 151.

i Lib. eodem. 2. ca. 13. pa. 215.

k Ca. 13. lib. 2.

l *Si Clementis germanam epiſtolam hanc eſſe dixerimus (ut Bar. ipſe fit. an. 102. nu. 6.) falſo inſcripta eſt, & ad Simeonem potius tunc Hieroſolymorum Epiſcopum, quam ad Iacobum longe antea defunctũ, ſcripta fuit.* Bar. an. 69 nu. 43.

m Poſſ. in Clemente, in ſuo apparatu.

n *Hæc epiſtola potius ad Simeonem qui etiam frater Domini dicitur, ſcripta eſt: & in titulum epiſtolæ mendoſe, vox (Iacobum) irrepſit.* Bin. notis in epiſt. 1. *Clem.*

p *Ne ſi ad Simeonem Iacobi ſucceſſorem, aut Marcum Alexandriæ Epiſcopum, aut alium ullum ſcribere juſſiſſet, &c.* Turr. ca. ille 13. pa. 211.

q *Quid coegit eum eò imprudentiæ delabi, ut ad eum ſcribere Clementem mandaret Petrus, quem ipſe ſciebat jam mortuum.* ibid. pa. 208.

r *Hæc tibi frater Iacobe ab ore ſancti Petri accepi, tibiq; inſinuare ſtudui, ut ſervari omnia immaculate præcipias.* Epiſt. Clem. in fine.

ſ *Cauſa graviſſima ſcribendi ad Jacobum jam mortuum juſſu Petri, de doctrinâ ad omnes Epiſcopos pertinente.* Turr. loc. cit. pa. 211.

t *Ita certè eſt ut iſti dicunt, non potuiſſe ignorare Petrum fuiſſe jam ante annos 8. Iacobum mortuum.* ibid. pa. 208.

u *Cauſa graviſſima ſcribendi per transfigurationem.* pa. 211.

x *Simile exemplum in alijs ejuſdem Clementis libris cernitur. In utroque eſt quædam fictio ſeu inductio perſonæ quod genus totum ad imitationem perſonarum pertinet.* ibid. pa. 212. *Vtrobique eſt imitatio perſonarum.* pa. 213.

y *Si ad ullum aliquem vivorum ſcripſiſſet, videretur magis eum diligere aut honorare, & æmulationis, vel invidiæ materiam præbuiſſe: Anne parvi momenti hæc cautio? Quis tam obtuſus ſit, ut ſic ſentiat?* ibid. pa. 211.

z *Cum Petrus mandat Clementi ut ad Iacobum mortuum ſcribat clariſſimum teſtimonium reſurrectionis præbet.* ibid. pa. 212.

godly

godly exhortation and advice for government of the Church *Clement* gives unto him:) and ſuch like; in the end he concludes [p], that ſuch as are Catholikes muſt not doubt [q] of the truth of this Epiſtle, though they know not the reaſon why it was written to a dead man: and withall, that with men who have reaſon and judgement, *certum eſſe debet*; ſuch muſt aſſure themſelves that both S. *Peter* and *Clement* had and knew reaſons why the one commanded to write, and the other did write unto a dead man. Whereas now the Cardinals worthy demonſtration? Had hee and *Binius* beene men of reaſon and judgement, and conſidered (as no doubt but they read) that tract of *Turrian*, (ſeeing unto it they referre us) they might have ſeene therein divers reaſons why *Theodoret* might write to *Iohn*, though he were dead; for every one of *Turrians* reaſons is as forcible to defend this Epiſtle of *Theodoret*, as they are to excuſe *Clement*, for writing to *Iames*, who was dead long before: But the caſe is now altered, the Cardinals demonſtration holds onely in thoſe writings that diſtaſte him, or make for us, and againſt their cauſe. But *ſi in rem ſint*, if any ſuch writing bring (as all the decretals doe) either honour to the Romane See, or gaine to the Romane Court, though they were writ to one that was dead, I ſay not ſeven, but ſeven times ſeven yeares before, they ſhall bee honoured as the true and undoubted writings of the authors.

p *Catholici vero ſi qui ſint, &c.* pa.215.

q *Etiamſi unde, aut quomodo ad nos profecta ſint neſciamus, tamē propter antiquorum authoritatem ita tenemus, ut de eis dubitare nefas eſſe exiſtimemus.* Ibid.

3. Let mee adde but one other example, but that is ſuch an one as doth cut all the ſinewes, yea, the very heart-ſtrings of the Cardinals demonſtration. The tranſlation of *Chryſoſtomes* body or reliques by *Theodoſius* the younger, more than thirty yeares after his death, from *Comana*, where hee dyed in baniſhment, to *Conſtantinople*, is a matter ſo teſtified by *Socrates* [r], *Theodoret* [s], *Marcellinus* [t], the great Menology [u], their Romane Martyrology [x], and others, that we doe not doubt of the truth therof; But ſince it is [y] retranſlated, as they ſay, from *Conſtantinople* to *Rome*, the onely ſhop indeed to utter all ſuch ware, and make the people goe a whoring after them: That thoſe his ſuppoſed reliques may be had in reverence, it is worthy the conſidering, how miraculouſly they have made the manner of his Tranſlation. *Nicephorus* [z] relates the ſumme of it, but, as by *Baronius* [a] it ſeemes, he borrowed it out of the luculent Oration of one *Coſmas Veſtiarius*, whether one of the Vaticane [b], or a Baronian author I know not, but ſo ignoble, and ſo unworthy an author, that *Poſſevine* judged him not worthy to bee named in his Bibliotheca, or reckoned among his *teſtes veritatis*. Out of this Tailors Oration hath the Cardinall [c] ſtitcht a very pretty Anile, the ſumme whereof is this: *Proclus* on a time making a panegyricall Oration in the praiſe of *Chryſoſtome*, the people were ſo flamed with the love and longing deſire after him, that they interrupted the Biſhop, and would not ſuffer him to make an end of his Sermon, crying out with many loud vociferations, they would have *Chryſoſtome*, *Chryſoſtome* and his reliques they would have: *Proclus* moved herewith, intreates the Emperour; the Emperour, at this their earneſt ſute ſent divers Senators (ſome [d] ſay an army together, with Clerks and Monkes) to bring with all pompe the body of *Chryſoſtome* from *Comana*; thither they goe, and come to the place where *Chryſoſtomes*

r *Lib.7.ca.44.*
s *Lib.5.ca.36.*
t *in ſuo Chron. an.438.*
u *Die 27.Ianu.*
x *Die 27.Ian.*
y *Inde poſtea Romam tranſlatum eſt. Martyr. Rom. Ibid.*
z *Lib.14.ca.43.*
a *Recitat idem Coſmas literas, à quibus puto Nicephorum exſcripſiſſe. Bar. an.438.nn.8.*
b *Habemus eum (Coſmæ ſermonem) in noſtra Bibliotheca diſcriptū. Bar. annot. in Martyr. Rom. Ian.27. et an.438.nu 7.*
c *An.438.*
d *Miſit exercitum militum una cum clericis. Georg. Patriar. Alex. in vita Chryſoſtomi, fol.77.*

ſtomes body was kept in a ſilver Coffin: Once, againe [b], and very often they aſſay, yea, labor & ſtrive with all their ſtrength, w[th] all their skil, to lift up the Coffin, all was in vaine, the ſacred body [c] was more immovable than a rock; they certifie this news to the Emperor, who called *Proclus*, & other holy men to adviſe further about that matter; in the end the reſolution of them all [d] was, that the Emperour *Theodoſius* ſhould write a Letter to *Chryſoſtome, Supplicis inſtar libelli*, in forme of a ſupplication, asking him forgiveneſſe for the ſinnes which *Arcadius* his father had committed againſt him, & *humilibus precibus*, to beſeech him with moſt lowly prayers that hee would returne to *Conſtantinople*, and take his old See againe, praying him that hee would no longer by his abſence afflict them, being ſo deſirous of his body, yea, of his aſhes, yea, of his ſhadow. The Emperour did ſo, the forme of whoſe letter of ſupplication out of the *Tailor Coſmas*, firſt *Nicephorus*, and then *Baronius* expreſſe, though the Cardinall for good cauſe was loath to give *Chryſoſtome* the title of a Patriarke, and *Pater Patrum*, which *Nicephorus* [e] ſets downe; thoſe either the Tailor or the Cardinall concealeth or altereth. The Emperours letters were ſent and brought to the dead corps, and with great reverence laid upon the breſt and heart of *Chryſoſtome*, and the next day the Prieſts with great eaſe took up the body, and brought it to *Conſtantinople* into the Church of the holy Apoſtles. There firſt (as out of *Nicephorus* the Cardinal relateth) the Emperour with the people, *ſupplex communem precationem pro Parentibus fecit, made an humble prayer for his Parents*, and more ſpecially entreated for his Mother, that her grave [f], which had ſhaken and been ſicke of a palſie, and made a noiſe and ratling for thirty five yeares together might now at length ceaſe; & the holy man heard the requeſt, granted it; the graves palſie was cured, ſo that it ſhaked no more. Then *Proclus* the Biſhop placed dead *Chryſoſtome in eundem Thronum*, in the very ſame See and Epiſcopall ſeat with himſelfe, all the people applauding and crying, O Father *Chryſoſtome* receive thy See; and then by a miracle beyond the degree of admiration, the lips [g] of *Chryſoſtome* (five and thirty yeares after hee was laid in his grave) opened and bleſſed all the people, ſaying, *Peace be to you*; and this both the Patriarke *Proclus*, and the people ſtanding by, teſtified [h] that they heard. Thus farre the Cardinals narration out of his Tailor *Coſmas* and *Nicephorus*.

4. Say now in earneſt, is not this a ſtory able to put downe *Heliodore, Orlando*, and all the fictions of all the Poets? their wits are barren, their conceits dull, they are all but very botchers to the Cardinals Taylor. It is not my purpoſe to ſtand now to refute ſuch a lying legend: The Cardinals friends may ſee the cenſure which their Carthuſian Monke [i] *Tilmannus* gives of it and of *Nicephorus*, the onely author that he knew, till *Baronius* pull'd this blinde Tailor out of a corner; Though I beleeve (ſaith hee) God to bee omnipotent, yet I beleeve not all which is here written of *Chryſoſtome, ſed fides penes lectorẽ eſto, let the reader chooſe whether hee will beleeve it or not*; for the writers of mens lives, who lived before *Nicephorus*, (and hee writ about the yeare 1328.) would not have concealed or ſmothered in ſilence, *rem*

tam

b *In thecâ argentea, ſacra Iohannis pignora aſſervabantur, inde ea auferre et deferre conantibus, nemine reſiſtente minimè conceſſum fuit, yea ſæpe fruſtra tentata. Bar. an. 438. nu. 8*

c *Sacro corpore inſtar ſilicis, loco inhæreſcente et immobili permanente. Ibid.*

d *Imperatoris ſententia ab omnibus æquæ probata atque laudata fuit. Ibid.*

e *Iohanni, aureis oris Patriarchiæ. Nic. lo. cit. et, At tu pater patrum, &c. Ib.*

f *Precatus eſt, ut tumuli ejus motus atq; ſtrepitus conſiſteret, 35. enim annis jam is quatiebatur. Bar. ibid. nu. 12.*

g *Ipſe Chryſoſtomus labijs rurſum apertis, ad populum dixiſſe fertur, Pax vobis. Coſmas apud Bar. loco citat. et Niceph.*

h *Id circumſtantes homines et Patriarcha Proclus, ſe audiſſe, teſtati ſunt. Coſ. et Niceph. loc. cit.*

i *Ad optimum quemq; lectorum magistros Carthuſiani poſt vitam Chryſoſt. apud Geor. pat. Alex.*

tanti momenti, a matter of ſo great moment. Thus the Carthuſian, whoſe judgement may juſtly be thought to bee the more weighty, becauſe of all the ancient Fathers there is none (I ſpeake it confidently) who hapned to have more fabulous writers than are *Palladius* (as he is called) *Leo* and *George* the writers, or rather the deviſers of *Chryſoſtomes* acts, his life and death. Any one of them doting after ſuch miraculous reports, would have painted out this miracle of miracles, with all the wit and words which they had: That which I onely obſerve is the ſtrange, and if you pleaſe, miraculous lewd dealing of *Baronius*. This Epiſtle of *Theodoſius*, though it was written to *Chryſoſtome* more than thirty yeares after his death, the Cardinall approves, applaudes, and for a rare monument hee commends [k] it, and all that appendant fable to all poſterity. Why? it is an excellent ſtory indeed to perſwade the adoration of reliques, invocation of Saints, prayers for the dead, and ſuch like. Had this Epiſtle of *Theodorets* contained ſuch ſtuffe, it ſhould have had every way the like applauſe from his Cardinalſhip, becauſe it wants ſuch matters, and croſſeth in very many things the Cardinals Annals, Oh it is nothing but a fiction, and a very forgery of ſome lewd naughty varlet. It is demonſtrated to be ſuch, becauſe it was written to *Iohn* Biſhop of *Antioch*, who was dead but 7. yeares before, whereas more than foure times ſeven yeares, cannot hinder the Epiſtle of *Theodoſius* written to the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* after hee was dead, to be an authentike and undoubted record. This may ſerve the Cardinall for the firſt anſwere, who is now bound in all equity, either to confeſſe his owne demonſtration to be fallacious, or to proclaime the Epiſtle of Pope *Clement*, and the other of *Theodoſius* with that whole narration, to be fictitious, and his owne Annals a fabulous legend.

k *Concionem illam rati, tibi ſore chariorem.* Bar. an 438. nu. 2. *Coſmas veſtiarius luculenta oratione de eâdē tranſlatione habitâ quæ geſta fuerunt exactè recenſet.* Ibid. nu. 7. et alia ſimiliahabet.

5. My ſecond anſwer is, that though *Iohn*, to whom this Epiſtle is directed, was dead, yet that proves onely the title or inſcription to be amiſſe, or that *Theodoret* writ not this Epiſtle to *Iohn*; it cannot prove (which the Cardinall undertooke to doe) that the Epiſtle is forged, and not written by *Theodoret*: For the Epiſtle it ſelfe to bee truly *Theodorets*, his owne Sermon publikely preached at *Antioch* before *Domnus* after the death of *Cyrill*, and mentioned in the Synodall Acts [l] next after this Epiſtle, doth clearly manifeſt; for the ſcope and purpoſe of that ſermon is the ſame which is expreſſed in the Epiſtle. In the Epiſtle *Theodoret* declareth his eagerneſſe in defending the doctrine of *Neſtorius*, and withall rejoyceth and inſulteth over *Cyrill* being dead, who was then the chiefe oppugner of the hereſies of *Neſtorius*. The very ſame eagerneſſe for Neſtorianiſme, and love to his hereſies, as alſo the like joy for *Cyrils* death doth his ſermon expreſſe more fully, ſaying, *Nemo neminem jam cogit blaſphemare, none doth now* (ſeeing *Cyrill* is dead) *compell any man to blaſpheme*, (ſo hee cals the Catholike faith.) Where are thoſe (to wit *Cyrill*) who teach that God was crucified? It was the man Chriſt, and not God who was crucified: It was the man IESVS that dyed, and it was GOD the Word who raiſed him from the dead. *Non jam eſt contentio, Now* (ſeeing *Cyrill* is dead) *there is no contention; Oriens & Egyptus ſub uno jugo eſt*, the Eaſt & *Egypt* (that

l *Conc. Coll. 5. 5. pa. 559. b.*

(that is, as well thoſe who are under the Patriarke of *Alexandria*, as they who are under the Patriarke of *Antioch*) are all under one yoke; that is, all ſubmit themſelves to one faith, that is, to Neſtorianiſme. *Mortua eſt invidia, & cum eo mortua eſt contentio; Envy* (hee meaneth *Cyrill*, who ſo much hated and oppugned the doctrine of *Neſtorius*) *is now dead, and all contention is dead and buried with him.* Let now the *Theopaſchites*, (hee meanes Catholikes, who taught God to have ſuffered and dyed) let them now bee at quiet. Thus preached *Theodoret* after the death of *Cyrill*, inſulting over him being dead, triumphing that now (ſeeing *Cyrill* was dead) Neſtorianiſme did and would prevaile. Who can imagine, but that the Epiſtle, maintaining the ſame hereſie inſulting in the ſame triumphing manner at the death of *Cyrill*, was written by *Theodoret*, when he publikely in his ſermon before a Patriarke, uttered the ſame matter. Would *Theodoret* feare or forbeare to write that in a letter, which hee neither did feare, nor could forbeare to profeſſe openly in a ſermon, and that in ſo ſolemne a place and aſſembly? or was *Theodoret* orthodoxall, and a lover of *Cyrill* in his writings before the death of *Cyrill*, who was hereticall, and ſo full with the dregs of Neſtorianiſme after the death of *Cyrill*, that he muſt vent them, and with them diſgorge his malice and ſpite againſt *Cyrill* in an open Pulpit, and in the hearing of a Patriarke, and all the people of *Antioch*? It is not the inſcription or title of the Epiſtle, but the Epiſtle it ſelfe which the fift Councell and wee after it doe ſtand upon. Had not they knowne the Epiſtle to bee *Theodorets* they needed not by it to have proved that *Theodoret*, after the *union*, yea, after the death of *Cyrill* was eager, violent, yea, virulent alſo in defence of the hereſies of *Neſtorius*; that his publike ſermon by them cited and preached after *Cyrils* death, and againſt *Cyrill*, had beene a ſufficient proofe and demonſtration of that; but becauſe they were ſure this was the true Epiſtle of *Theodoret*, they thought good to teſtifie that he was in writing the ſelfe ſame man as hee was in preaching, that is in both a ſpiteſull maligner of *Cyrill*, in both a malicious and malignant Neſtorian, and that long after the *union* made betwixt *Iohn* and *Cyrill*, yea, that even after the death of *Cyrill* he continued both to write and to ſpeake the ſame.

6. Obſerve now by the way the fraudulent dealing of *Baronius* and *Binius* in this cauſe. This paſſage taken out of a ſermon publikely preached at *Antioch* againſt *Cyrill*, and in an inſulting manner for his death, this they doe not, nor durſt they carpe at it. It is teſtified by all the Biſhops of the fift Councell to have beene a part of *Theodorets* ſermon: the Epiſtle which likewiſe is teſtified by them all to bee *Theodorets*, containing the ſame matter with his ſermon, that they raile at, and revile both it and the writer of it, becauſe in the inſcription thereof they have eſpyed an errour. It had beene honeſt dealing in the Cardinall and *Binius*, ſeeing theſe are fethers of one wing, either to have acknowledged both, or denyed both to bee the brood of *Theodoret*.

7. Againe, the Cardinall undertooke to prove, that ſtill after the *union* betwixt *Iohn* and *Cyrill*, *Theodoret* was a Catholike, and defen-

der

der of the Catholike faith, and becauſe the Epiſtle demonſtrates the contrary, he will not allow it to bee *Theodorets*, but a forgery written in his name. Admit it were, yet that part of *Theodorets* ſermon is truly his, nor doth eyther *Baronius* or *Binius* deny it to bee his. Now by this ſermon is *Theodoret* as effectually proved and demonſtrated, as by the Epiſtle to have beene an eager oppugner of the Catholike faith, and an obſtinate defender of all the hereſies of *Neſtorius* after the death of *Cyrill*, which was twelve [m] yeares after the *union*: So that although the Epiſtle were not *Theodorets*, or had never beene extant, yet the Cardinals poſition for *Theodorets* Orthodoxy is clearly and certainly refuted by the ſermon of *Theodoret* made twelve yeares after the *union*.

m *Vnio facta an.* 432. *Bar. ibi an.* nn. 77. *Cyrillus autem obyit an.* 444. *Bar. ibi an.* nn. 9.

8. Further yet the Cardinall to defend the Orthodoxy of *Theodoret* urgeth ſtrongly, and relyeth upon the Epiſtles, which in their Vaticane or Mint-houſe are ſtamped with the name of *Theodoret*; whereas if there were no other proofes, this one ſermon of *Theodorets* is an undoubted evidence that they can bee none of *Theodorets*, but are forged in his name; for the whole ſcope, at which thoſe Epiſtles [n] ayme, is to magnifie *Theodoret* both for his integrity of life, uprightneſſe in judgement, laborioufneſſe in preaching, and ſpecially for his ſoundneſſe in the Catholike faith, that he was never reproved nor accuſed by any, no not in ſixe and twenty yeares, for his doctrine; that he never accuſed any, and ſpecially for *Cyrill*, that *Theodoret* loved and honoured him for a learned and pious man, *& mirificè coluit ejus memoriam*, when *Cyrill* was dead, *hee wonderfully honoured his memory*, calling him a man of bleſſed memory; all which and a hundred ſuch like matters contained in thoſe Epiſtles are undeniably convicted to bee untrue by this ſermon of his, wherein he vomiteth out in a moſt ſolemne aſſembly, together with the blaſphemies of *Neſtorius*, moſt ſlanderous revilings not onely againſt *Cyrill*, at whoſe death hee inſulteth, but againſt all Catholikes, whom he, according to the Neſtorian language, cals *Theopaſchites* and heretikes: with ſuch falſe, fained, and lying writings doth the Cardinall fight againſt the fift Synod and the Acts thereof.

n *Vt clarum eſt ex Epiſt. Theod. ad Dioſcorum, ad Leonem, ad Nomum, de quibus diximus ſupra, c.* 33.

9. Yea, but ſtill the Cardinall will reply, the Inſcription unto *Iohn*, who before was dead, ſhewes the Epiſtle to *Iohn* to bee forged, and to be none of *Theodorets*: It doth not; for the inſcription or title of an Epiſtle or other writing, may bee erronious, and the Epiſtle truly his whoſe name it beares, which the Cardinal may ſee, if need were, in a hundred examples.

10. In the Epiſtle of Pope *Clement* unto *Iames*, whereof before wee ſpake, the Cardinall [o] and *Binius* [p] both confeſſe the inſcription to be falſe, and yet they both hold the Epiſtle to bee Pope *Clements*, yea, they can excuſe that, and ſay it was but an errour in writing *Iames* [q] in ſtead of *Simeon* in the title, were they not too too partiall and malicious againſt this holy Synod, they would as eaſily have uſed the ſame excuſe for *Theodorets* Epiſtle, and have ſaid, the Epiſtle is truly his, but in the inſcription in the Acts, the name of *Iohn* is, by the writers miſtaking, ſet in ſtead of *Domnus*.

o *Ad.* 69. *nn.* 43

p *Notis in* 1. *Epiſtolam Clementis.*

q *In titulum Epiſtolæ, mendoſa vox* [*Iacobum*] *irrepſit. Bin. loc. cit.*

11. *Theodoret*

11. *Theodoret* in his hiſtory [r] ſets down an Epiſtle of Pope *Damaſus*, againſt *Eunomius* and other heretikes, the title in him is thus, The confeſſion of faith which Pope *Damaſus* ſent to *Paulinus* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*; and with this inſcription it is alſo publiſhed in the *Venice* edition of the Councels by *Nicholinus*. Did *Damaſus* write or ſend this to *Paulinus* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*? No, he did not; there was no *Paulinus* then, nor long after that Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, as [t] *Baronius* and [t] *Binius* at large prove and profeſſe. What then? may we here conclude by the Cardinals demonſtration; certainly this Epiſtle was none of Pope *Damaſus* writings, it is a forgery and a counterfeit, ſeeing it is written to *Paulinus*, whereas there was no ſuch man at all? No, the demonſtration holds not in Pope *Damaſus*, nor in his writings; for notwithſtanding this errour in the title, *Baronius* and *Binius* [u] hold it both to be the true, undoubted, and Synodall Epiſtle of Pope *Damaſus*, and truely ſent from him, but ſent to *Paulinus* Biſhop of *Antioch*, not to any *Paulinus* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*. Applie now this to the Epiſtle of *Theodoret*, may not it likewiſe be true, and truly written by *Theodoret*, though the title be either falſe or unpoſſible? If any demand how that errour in *Theodoret*, touching the title of the Epiſtle, might happen, *Baronius* and *Binius* impute [x] it to the malice and wilful fraud of *Theodoret*; but I much rather aſcribe it to the writer, who finding in *Theodoret* the name of *Paulinus*, without any addition, either ignorantly or wickedly, inſerted the falſe addition of *Theſſalonica*. Would the Cardinall have dealt favourably with the other inſcription of *Iohn*, and in ſtead of it have put *Domnus*, who was then Biſhop of *Antioch*, he might have ſpared his labour in this point.

12. In the ſixteenth Novell of *Iuſtinian* the inſcription is to *Anthimus* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, now the date of that Edict is on the thirteenth day of *Auguſt* in the yeare after the Conſulſhip of *Bellarius*, at which time it is certaine that not *Anthimus*, but *Mennas* was Biſhop, for *Mennas* ſate in the generall Councell held that yeare at *Conſtantinople*, which began on the ſecond of *May*; yea, the Emperour himſelfe on the ſixt of *Auguſt* in the ſame yeare and Conſulſhip, dates another Edict unto *Mennas*. So that undoubtedly there is an errour in the inſcription, and yet notwithſtanding this errour, the Edict it ſelfe is without all doubt *Iuſtinians*, nor will the Cardinals demonſtration hold in this.

13. The Epiſtle of *Fælix* the fourth [y] to *Sabina*, was written and dated on the twefth of the Kalends of *November*, at which time [a] *Fælix* was dead. What, may it by the Cardinals demonſtration be rejected for a counterfeit? No, the Cardinall [b] will tell you, it was indeed the Popes Epiſtle but of *Boniface* the ſucceſſor of *Fælix*, and not as the inſcription tels, of Pope *Fælix*, *& facile accidiſſe potuit*, *it might eaſily happen*, that the name of *Fælix* might bee put in ſtead of *Boniface* his next ſucceſſor. Might not the very ſame and as eaſily happen in this Epiſtle of *Theodoret*, that the name of *Iohn* might be put in the inſcription in ſtead of *Domnus* his next ſucceſſor?

14. There is an Epiſtle of Pope *Silverius* [c], wherein he writ an excommunication againſt *Vigilius* uſurping his See, it is dated in ſome Copies

[r] *Lib. 5. ca. 10. et ſecundum Chryſt. ca. 11.*

[t] *Vides Lector, ne fingi quidem poſſe ut Paulinus, quem jactat Theodoretus, fuerit Epiſcopus Theſſalonicenſis. Bar. an. 378. nu. 43.*

[t] *Bin. not. in Conc. Rom. 3. ſub Damaſo poſt profeſſionem fidei Apollinarii, &c. pa. 508.*

[u] *Scripta fuit Synodalis Epiſtola à Damaſo ex Concilio Romano ad Paulinum Antiochenum. Bar. an. 378. nn. 41.*

[x] *Itidem Binius loco citat.*

[x] *Locis citatis.*

[y] *Extat tom. 2. Conc. pa. 390.*

[a] *Hac Chronologia mendoſa eſt, nam hoc menſe Bonifacius jam Pontifex creatus erat, ut patet ſupra. Bin. not. in eam Epiſt. et Bar. an. 530. nu. 1.*

[b] *Facile accidiſſe potuit, ut loco Bonifacy, Fælicis nomen fuerit appoſitum. Bar. loco citat.*

[c] *Epiſt. 1. Sylv. extat. tom. 2. Conc. pa. 476.*

Copies in the yeare of *Baſilius*, in others of *Belliſarius*, being Conſuls. Now in all the time [d] *Silverius* was Pope, neither was *Baſilius* nor *Belliſarius* Conſuls. What then? ſhall the Popes Epiſtle be rejected as a a forgery, a counterfeit? No, by no meanes. The Cardinall [e] often mentioneth it, honours it for a rare monument; and to helpe that errour, he tels us the date is added more than ſhould be. Might not the like happen to the inſcription of *Theodorets* letter in the Synodall acts? Might it not happen that the inſcription was onely to the Archbiſhop of *Antioch*, & that the name of *Iohn* was added more than ſhould be? *Epiphanius* in his Book of hereſies ſayth [f] that *Iuſtine Martyr* dyed when *Adrian* was Emperour; a manifeſt untruth, for *Iuſtine Martyr* writ an Apology for the Chriſtian faith unto *Antoninus* [g] the ſucceſſor of *Adrian*, and he was put to death under *Mar. Aurelius*, and *Verus*, 24. yeares [h] after the death of *Adrian*. Will the Cardinall have his demonſtration to hold here in *Epiphanius*? ſo that his booke againſt hereſies muſt be condemned for a counterfeit, and none of *Epiphanius* writing? No, *error irrepſit, there ſlipt an error into Epiphanius*; for *Adrian* is written in ſtead of *Antoninus*, as the Cardinall [i] tels you: but it rather ſeemes in ſtead of *Aurelius*, (under whom *Iuſtine* dyed.) Had the Cardinall beene any way as indifferent to *Theodorets* letters, hee would likewiſe have ſaid, *error irrepſit, an error is ſlipt into the inſcription*, by writing *Iohn* in ſtead of his ſucceſſor *Domnus*, rather than have condemned the writing for a forgery.

d *Temporibus Sylverii nullus convenit Belliſarii conſulatus, neq; Baſilii. Bar. an. 539. 3. & idem ait Bin. Not. margin. ad eam epiſtolam An. 539. nu. 1. & 4.*

f *Epiph. hær 46.*

g *Juſt. Mart. ad Antoninum pium defenſio.*

h *Nam Hadrianus obiit an. 140. Bar. illo an. nu. 1. Iuſtinus vero an. 165. Bar. illo an. nu. 1*

i *Lec. citat. & Notis in Martyr. Rom. Apr. 13*

14. In the twenty third Cauſe, *Queſtion* 4. *Cap.* 30. in the ancient title it was cited as a text of *Sylveſter*, a manifeſt errour of *Sylveſter* inſtead of *Sylverius*. Did the Gregorian Correctors, for this falſe title or name of *Sylveſter* inſerted, condemne that Canon or Epiſtle as a counterfeit? no; but approving the text as true they amended the title, and reſtored it to *Sylverius*. In the very ſame Chapter it is ſaid, that *Guilliſarius* cauſed *Sylverius* to bee depoſed, there was no *Guilliſarius* that ever did that, but it was *Belliſarius*; yet for that error of the name, which yet remaines * uncorrected, is not the Canon or Epiſtle rejected.

* *Guilliſarius, quia eſt initium capitis non eſt mutatum. Not. Greg. in illud cap.*

15. In that fragment of this Synod which *Binius* [i] out of *Tyrius* commendeth, it is ſayd that the fift Synod which decreed the Patriarchall dignity to the Biſhop of *Ieruſalem*, was held in the time of *Vigilius* of *Rome*, *Eutychius* of *Conſtantinople*, and *Paule* of *Antioch*. Now that by the Cardinals demonſtration was never; for it is certaine that there was no *Paul* Biſhop of *Antioch* in Pope *Vigilius* his dayes. Before this Synod, was *Ephreem* [k], who ſate eighteene yeares, in whoſe fourteenth, or fifteenth yeare began *Vigilius* [l] to be Pope, to him ſucceeded *Domnus* [m], hee ſate 18. yeares, in whoſe [n] ſeventh or eighth yeare this fift Councell was held, and himſelfe perſonally ſubſcribed unto [o] it, and about his tenth yeare dyed *Vigilius* [p]. So this decree, by the Cardinals owne reaſon, is but a forgery (as in very truth it is.) Now if he to ſave the credit of that worthleſſe fragment, will admit an error of the writing, *Paulus* being put for *Domnus*, why ſhould he be ſo hard hearted againſt the other writing of *Theodoret*, as not to thinke a like errour of the pen in it, and *Iohannes* to be put for *Dominus*?

i *Poſt 5. Concil. pa. 606. a.*

k *Ephrem ſedere cæpit an. 526. Bar. eo an. nu. 59 ſedet ante an. 18. Niceph. in Chron.*

l *Vigilius cæpit an. 440. Bar. eo an. nu. 9 ut eſt Ephraimi an. 15.*

m *Niceph. in Chron. & Bar. an 446. nu. 68.*

n *Nam 8. Domni eſt an. 553. quo habitum eſt concilium hoc 5.*

o *Collat. 8. pa. 588. a.*

p *Dominus cæpit an. 446. quare ejus an. 10. erit 555. quo anno obiiſſe Vigilium, ait Bar. an. 555. nu. 1.*

16. That

16. That *Edict* of *Iuſtinian* which wee have ſo often mentioned in the ancient editiõs of Councels before *Binius* had this title; The *Edict* of *Iuſtinian* ſent unto Pope *Iohn* the ſecond. *Contius* [r] the learned Lawyer, defends that inſcription. *Baronius* himſelfe ſomewhat forgetfull of what elſewhere hee writeth, cals this [f] Edict, *Conſtitutio data ad Iohan. a Conſtitution ſent to Pope Iohn*, & again [t], *Iuſtinian expreſly witneſſeth this in his Edict to P. Iohn*; a falſe title & inſcriptiõ without al doubt, *Iohn* being dead ten [u] yeares before this *Edict* was either publiſhed, or writ, as *Baronius* [x] himſelfe both declares and proves, profeſſing that Inſcription to be falſe. Had the Cardinall remembred his demonſtration drawne from the title and Inſcription, oh how happily, how eaſily had he avoided all his trouble of defending *Vigilius* for writing againſt, and contradicting that Edict: Hee might have ſaid, Why, that Edict was none of *Iuſtinians*, nor ever publiſhed by him; for the Inſcription is to Pope *Iohn* who was dead long before. And becauſe the fift Councell was aſſembled for diſcuſſing that truth which the Emperor in his Edict had delivered, and *Vigilius* with the other Neſtorians did oppugne, the Cardinal againe might have denyed that ever there had beene any ſuch fift Councell, or any Synodall Acts at all of it; for if there was no Edict there could bee no Councel, which was aſſembled and gathered for that onely cauſe, to define the truth delivered by the Edict. This had beene a ſhort cut indeed, and the Cardinall, like another *Alexander*, by this one ſtroke had diſpatched all the doubts and difficultes which neither hee nor all his friends can ever untwine or looſe in this Gordian knot. But the Cardinals demonſtrations were not in force as then, nor ever, I thinke, till the acts of this fift Synod, and in them the Epiſtle of *Theodoret* came to his tryal: for notwithſtanding the falſhood of that inſcription & title, the Card. very honeſtly acknowledgeth that to bee no counterfeit, but a true imperiall Edict, truely publiſhed by *Iuſtinian* [y], contradicted by *Vigilius*, confirmed as touching the doctrine of the *Three Chapters*, by the fift Councel. Here he can ſay [z] that addition to *Iohn* is added, & put amiſſe in the title by ſome later hand, by ſome who knew not accurately to diſtinguiſh the times: may not the ſame as truly excuſe this writing of *Theodoret*? the name of *Iohn* is added in the title by ſome who knew not accurately to diſtinguiſh the times, but yet the Epiſtle it ſelfe it is truely *Theodorets*. It had beene honeſt and faire dealing in the Cardinal, any one of theſe waies to have excuſed this errour in the title of *Theodorets* Epiſtle, rather than by reaſon of ſuch an errour, as happeneth in many Epiſtles and writings, to declame, not onely againſt the Epiſtle as a baſe forgery, and none of *Theodorets*, but even againſt all the Acts [a] of this holy generall Councell, as unworthy of credit, becauſe among them an Epiſtle with an erronious Inſcription is found extant.

17. None, I thinke, doe nor ever will defend the Acts of this or any other Counceł, or any humane writings to be ſo abſolutely intire, and without all corruption, as that no fault of the writer or exſcriber hath crept into them; ſuch faults are frequent in the Acts almoſt of all Councels. To omit the reſt; in thoſe of *Chalcedon* [b], the Epheſine Latrociny is ſaid to have beene held when *Zeno* and *Poſthumianus* were Conſuls,

r *In append. ad Cod. Iuſtin.*

f *Bar. an. 451. nu. 129.*

t *An 530. nu. 4.*

u *Iohannes 2. obijt an. 9. Iuſtiniani. Bar. an. 535. nu. 26. at Edictum editum an. 20. Iuſtiniani Bar. an. 546. nu. 8.*

x *Iohannis Papæ tempore editum, mendaci inſcriptione notatur Bar. an. 546. nu. 10. liquido conſtat, non ante præſens tempus (an. vid. 20. Iuſtin.) potuiſſe eſſe conſcriptum libellum illum. Bar. ibid. & conſtat Edictum Vigily tempore conſcriptum, an. 534. nu. 21.*

y *Imperator promulgavit Edictum. Bar. an. 546. nu. 8. Hactenus Iuſtiniani Edictum. ibid. nu. 37. et ſæpiſſime ſimilia.*

z *Scias perperam additum, ipſum miſſum ad Iohannem. Bar. an. 534. nu. 21. et an. 546. nu 10.*

a *At quam fidem vrgo, merentur Acta huiuſmodi, qua ſunt his contexta commentis? Bar. an. 553. nu. 46.*

b *Act. 1. pa. 8. a.*

Consuls, in the third Indiction. An undoubted errour; For that Ephesine Conventicle was held when [c] *Protogenes* and *Asterius* were Consuls, not when *Zeno* and *Posthumianus*; neither were *Zeno* and *Posthumianus* Consuls in the third, but in the first [d] Indiction: neither was the Councell held either in the first or in the third, but in the [e] second Indiction; and therefore both *Baronius* [f], and *Binius* [g] say, these words [*tempore Zenonis & Posthumiani venerabilium Consulum indictione tertia*] are false, and by surreption crept into the Acts. Againe, the sixteenth Action or Session is sayd to have beene on the twenty eight [h] of October. A manifest errour; seeing their thirteenth Action [i] or Session was on the nine and twentieth, and their fourteenth [k] Session on the thirtieth of October. Yea there are in those Acts farre greater faults than these. For in the third Action [l] is set downe the Imperiall Edict of *Valentinian* and *Martian*, for condemning of *Eutyches*: and yet that Edict was not published untill the 26. of Ianuary, when [m] *Sporarius* was Consull: whereas the Councell of *Chalcedon* and all the Acts thereof was ended on the first day of November [n] the yeare before: that is, more than two moneths before that Edict was made. In the seventh Session also there is inserted by *Binius* [o] and *Baronius* [p] an whole Action concerning *Domnus*, who was deposed in the Ephesine Latrociny, where the Councel decreed that *Maximus* should allow *Domnus* some charges to serve him *pro victu & vestitu*. A forged Action, and that in the highest degree, as not onely the time when it was held, to wit, on the twenty seventh [q] of October; whereas the Session [r] which followed it was held on the five and twentieth, or six and twentieth day of the same moneth, doth declare; but because this *Domnus* was dead before the Councell of *Chalcedon*, as both the Imperiall *Edict* of *Iustinian* [t], and the fift Councell, doe certainly witnesse. Could the Cardinall have found such additions or forgeries inserted into the Acts of this fift Councell, *quos ludos daret*, how would hee have triumphed in the disgrace of these Acts, to have writings in them, and as parts of them and their Synodall Acts, which were not made long after the end of the Councell? to have an whole Action or consultation, what allowance should be made to a dead man for provision of his food and rayment? Here had beene a field indeed for the Cardinall to have insulted over these Acts. And yet, notwithstanding these errors in the two first, and undoubted additions of the Emperours Edict in the third, and that whole ridiculous action, nay fiction, in the fourth, patched unto the Acts of *Chalcedon*, the Cardinall will not so disgrace those Acts, as to use his demonstration against the credit of them, or that Councell: And yet see his unequall and unhoneſt dealing in these matters, because but one name is inserted into the inscription, or by an error put in stead of another: the Cardinals choler breakes out in this manner against the Acts of this fift Synod, *Quam fidem* [u], *rogo*, I pray you what credit is to be given to such Acts?

c *Marcell. in chron. & hinc certo liquet, quia Conciliabulum Ephesinum sequutum est illud Constantinopoli habitum, in quo condemnatus est Eutyches à Flaviano, at hoc Constantinopoli habitum est, Protogene et Asterio. Coss. ut patet in Concil. Chalc. Act. 1. pa. 30.*

d *Vt liquet ex Marcell. in Chron.*

e *Vt liquet ex eodem Marc.*

f *Ba. an. 448 n. 58*

g *Hæc verba [tempore Zenonis et Posthumiani Indictione 3.] mendosa sunt & surreptitia. Bin. Not. in Concilia. Eph. to. 1. Conc. pa. 1017.*

h *Quinto Kalendas Novembris. Act. 16. Conc. Chalc.*

i *3. Kalend. Novemb. Conc. Chal. Act. 13.*

k *Pridie Kalend Nov. Conc. Chal. Act. 14.*

l *Pa. 84. b.*

m *Datum 7. Kalend. Febr. Sporario Coss. in fine Edicti.*

n *Nam ultima Sessio habita est Kalendis Novemb. dicitur enim ibi, hesterna die, postquam postulas vestra surrexit, &c. quare ultima Sessio fuit proxima die post Sessionem in qua Actio 14. & 15. continentur, at actio 14. habita est pridie Kalend. Novemb.*

o *Act 7. pa. 105 b.* p *Bar. an. 451. nu. 118.* q *Actio de Domno habita est 6. Kalend. Nov Bar. an. 451. nu. 129. et Bin. Not. ad Conc. chalc. pa. 18.* r *Nam actio sequens quæ etiam alia Sessio est, in qua Theodoreti causa tractatur, habita est sub octav. Kalend. Nov.* t *Chalcedonensis Synodus Domnum post mortem condemnavit. Edict. Iust. to. 2. Concil. pa. 498.* *Idem repetit Conc. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 575 b.* u *An. 553. nu. 46.*

18. Some three or foure errors of the pen, besides this of the inscription, I confesse are also in the Acts of this fift Synod. The fift Collation is sayd to have beene on the eight [m], (it should bee on the thirteenth or fourteenth) of May, seeing the fourth Collation was held on the twelfth [n] of that moneth. In the same fift Collation [o] *Cyrill* is alledged to say, *Non jam quidem sancta Synodus*, the holy Synod did not now pronounce a sentence against *Nestorius:* the negation (*non*) is by negligence either of *Binius*, or the Printer, crept in, and is certainly to be blotted out, which otherwise not onely makes Saint *Cyrill* to speake untruly, but even to contradict himselfe. In the same Action [p], there is recited an Epistle to *Andreas* Bishop of Samosat, in the inscription whereof *Theodorus* is written in stead of *Theodoretus*, seeing of the next Epistle being *Theodorets*, it is sayd, *ejusdem ad Nestorium*. It may be some few moe such errors may be found in these Acts of the fift Councell; but for the honour of them, I professe, they are so incorrupt and intire, that moe than these I doe not remember my selfe to have for a certainty observed in them. Neither doe such errours creep only into humane writings, their owne learned *Iansenius* [q] (after *Beza* [r]) will tell them, that the very sacred Scriptures are subject to the same: for whereas *Matth.* 27. 9. the Euangelist sayth it is written in the Prophet *Ieremy*; seeing the text there cited is not found in *Ieremie*, but in *Zachary*; although some thinke it to be a slip [s] in memory in Saint *Matthew*; others, that it is in some apochryphall [t] writing of *Ieremy*; others, that *Zachary* had two names (as many other Iewes) and so might be called either *Ieremie* or *Zacharie*; yet *Iansenius* not liking any of these conjectures, rests on this answer as most neare the truth, that either the name of *Zacharie* is *Scribæ culpâ commutatum in Ieremiam, by the errour and fault of the writer turned into Ieremy*; or else, that whereas the Euangelist sayd no more, but that this is written in the Prophet (in which sort without any addition or mention of name, some copies to have read that place, Saint *Austen* [u] is witnesse, and not onely *Rupertus*, but the *Syriack* translator read it in the same manner) some more audacious hand expressed the name of *Ieremy*. Do you thinke the Cardinall would or durst use his demonstration in this text? that seeing a wrong name is inserted (not in the title or inscription (as in this Epistle it is) but in the very text,) he would account the Gospell a forgery, and unworthy of credit? It is true, they are too too bold even with the Scriptures also: whereof they gave a notable proofe; first when (as it was credibly reported [x] to the relator) some of the Iesuites, even in their solemne Sermons in *Italy*, censured Saint *Paul* for an hot-headed person, who was transported with his pangs of zeale and eagernesse, beyond all compasse in his disputes, and that there was no great reckoning to bee made of his assertions; yea that he was dangerous to reade, as savouring of heresie in some places, and better perhaps he had never written: and againe, when (as some Catholikes [y] told it in the hearing of the relator) they held a consultation among them, to have censured by some meanes, and reformed the Epistle of Saint *Paul*. Though such be their audaciousnesse, yet I hope the Cardinall will not bee so censorious with the holy Gospell.

What

[m] *Octavo Idus Maias. Coll. 5. pa. 537. b.*
[n] *Collatio 4. die 4. Idus Maias.*
[o] *Pa. 548. a.*
[p] *Pa. 558. b.*
[q] *Cap. 140. Concord. Euang.*
[r] *Beza in cap. 27 Matth. v. 9.*
[s] *Videtur huc inclinare Aug. lib. 3. de cons. Euan. ca. 7.*
[t] *Sic Orig. sensit Homil. 35. in Matth.*
[u] *Loco citato.*
[x] *A Relation of the state of Religion in the West parts. fol. 14.*
[y] *Ibid.*

what hard hap then hath *Theodoret*, that hee alone among all writers, divine and humane, may not have the benefit of his book at the Cardinalls hand; but for one ſuch fault, not onely his writing muſt be rejected as a forgery, but the Synodall Acts, among which it ſtands, muſt be condemned as worthy of no credit?

19. If none of theſe can mollifie the Cardinals heart, let it yet further be conſidered, that in his owne Annals [a] it is ſayd of the conſent of *Vigilius* to the Edict, the fift Synod doth often give witneſſe, *quinetiam ſexta Synodus Actione ſeptimâ continet monumenta*, *Further alſo the ſixt Synod in the ſeventh Action containes the writings of Pope Vigilius againſt the three Chapters*. A ſaying ſo voyd of truth, that thoſe monuments of *Vigilius*, yea almoſt any one of them, is able to eat up all that whole ſeventh Action, it is ſuch a pittance to thoſe large writings of *Vigilius*. Beſides, in that ſeventh action of the ſixt Councell, there is neither monuments of *Vigilius*, nor ſo much as any mention of *Vigilius* at all, nor of the *three Chapters*. Let him againe conſider how hee ſaith [b], that *Cæleſtine* called the Epheſine Councell by the Emperour *Theodorus*; that is to ſay, never, if the Cardinall be not relieved with an error or ſcape of the writer. That elſewhere in the ſame Annalls he *ſayth, that by the Catholike Church the Romane Church is ſignified, as appeares *ex Epiſtola Hormiſdæ Papæ ad Iuſtinum Imperatorem*, *by the Epiſtle* (he quoteth the 22.) *of Pope Hormiſda to Iuſtinus*. An evident error. For neither is that 22. Epiſtle written to *Iuſtinus*, but to *Dorotheus* a Biſhop; neither is that which the Cardinall alledgeth, either in that 22. or in any other of all the epiſtles (they are five) which *Hormiſda* writ to *Iuſtinus*. But the Card. by a pretty miſtaking, firſt turnes *Iuſtinian* into *Iuſtinus*, and then pretends that to be written *Epiſt.* 22. and by *Hormiſda*, and to *Iuſtinus*; which is written by *Iuſtinian*, and to *Hormiſda*, and which followeth the 56. Epiſtle. Further yet let him remember, how in the ſame Annals [c] it is ſaid, that before the *Edict* of *Iuſtinian* was written, thoſe controverſies hapned betwixt *Theodorus* (Biſhop of *Cæſarea*) and *Paſcalis* the Deacon. The Card. might as wel have ſaid, that the *Edict* was never written nor publiſhed; for there was never any contention nor controverſie betwixt *Paſcalis* the Deacon, and *Theodorus*; and I doubt, or rather am out of doubt, that there was never any ſuch contention as the Cardinal dreameth of (the beſt author for it being *Liberatus*, one heretically affected in this cauſe, and maliciouſly bent againſt *Theodorus*) but if there was any ſuch controverſie, it was not betwixt *Theodorus* and *Paſcalis*, but betwixt *Theodorus* and *Pelagius*. *Pelagius* & not *Paſcalis* was the Popes Agent at *Conſtantinople* at that time, as not onely *Liberatus* [d], but *Procopius* [e], a man of better note teſtifieth. Now theſe foule errours (whereupon is conſequent that almoſt all which the Cardinall hath hiſtorified for ſome 10. or 11. yeares is utterly untrue) being extant and recorded in his Annals, though there be violent preſumption, to thinke that the Cardinall judged ſome of them to be indeed no errors, neither of his own memory, nor of the writers pen, ſeeing when he reviewed or retracted his Tomes, and corrected therein ſmall ſlips, and very motes to ſuch beames as theſe, as the miſtaking of a few months or dayes, or miſwri-

[a] *an.* 547. *nu.* 40

[b] *Bar. an.* 536. *nu.* 32.

* *Bar. an.* 534.

[c] *Bar. an.* 546. *nu.* 10.

[d] *Pelagius æmulus exiſtens Theodoro, voluntem nocere. Liber. Brev ca.* 23. 24. *& Pelagius Apocriſiarius Agapeti, Silverij & Vigily. Bar. an.* 536. *nu* 116.

[e] *Lib.* 3. *de Bell. Goth. pa.* 365. *Pelagius diu Conſtantinopoli commoratus.*

ting a word or ſyllable, and the like; yet hee not once mentioneth any correction in theſe places, yet am I content to allow theſe to bee but ſlips of the writer or Printer, as writing *Theodorus* in ſtead of *Theodoſius*, *Paſcalis* for *Pelagius*; from *Hormiſda*, for, to *Hormiſda*; to *Iuſtine*, for, from *Iuſtinian*; and *ſexta* for *quinta*, or *eadem quinta*; upon condition that the Cardinall and his friends will in like ſort conſent, that by an error of ſome writer of theſe Synodall acts, the name of *Iohn* is either inſerted when there was no name, or written in ſtead of *Domnus* in that inſcription. But if they be obſtinate and refuſe ſuch a reaſonable profer, the Card. and all his friends muſt be patient to heare, how juſtly and forcibly his owne demonſtation may in his owne words be retorted upon himſelfe, & theſe errors of his. Certainly theſe are patent and manifeſt lyes and frauds, deviſed by ſome hereticall knave or varlet, they are ſuch as every man may perceive to be written by him who was not in any meaſure a lover of Chriſtian piety: *Sed impudentiſſimi cujuſpiam Neſtorij figmentum, but they are the fiction of a moſt impudent Neſtorian forgerer. Et quam fidem rogo, merentur?* and what credit in the world can bee given to thoſe writings or Annals, which have ſuch untruths and fictions inſerted in them, and are *contexta*, compoſed and woven together with ſuch untruths? This being abundantly ſufficient to ſatisfie any indifferent man in this matter, yet would I a little further let the Reader ſee, how childiſhly and corruptly *Baronius* dealeth in this cauſe. It is true, I confeſſe, that *Iohn* dyed before *Cyrill*: for this is cleare and certaine, by many undoubted teſtimonies in the Councell of *Chalcedon*[f], not one of all which the Cardinall had the grace to alledge. But all the Cardinals reaſons are ſo weake and withall ſo full of fraud and untruth, that it is worthy your conſidering to ſee his blindneſſe and perverſeneſſe even in proving that which is true.

f *Act. 14. Vbi extat germana Cyrilli Epiſcopi Alexandrini Epiſtola ad Domnum Antiochenum. pa. 122. & ſæpius ſit mentio Cyrilli mortui cùm Domnus ille ſedebat Antiochiæ.*

20. His firſt reaſon is this; *I have ſhewed*[g] *this apertiſſimè, that Iohn dyed ſeven yeares before Cyrill by the Epiſtle which Theodoret writ to Domnus foure yeares ſince,* (that is, foure before the yeare 444.) *in the behalfe of one Felicianus, whoſe eſtate Theodoret recommends to Domnus.* Truly the Cardinall hath ſhewed himſelfe an egregious trifler hereby: For neither in the 440. nor in any foure yeares either before or after that, doth hee ſet downe any Epiſtle of *Theodorets* to *Domnus*, in the behalfe of *Felicianus*. The Epiſtle which the Cardinall dreameth of, is in behalfe of *Celeſtianus*, and that is indeed expreſſed *An.* 440[h]. where note I pray you, that the Cardinall by a ſlip either of his owne penne or memory, (as I verily ſuppoſe) or of his Scribe, names *Felicianus* in ſtead of *Celeſtianus*: God even by this, demonſtrating how unjuſtly he carpes at the Synodall Acts, for that very errour or ſlippe of a penne, which the Cardinall himſelfe falls into, even while hee, for the like ſlippe, declameth againſt thoſe holy Synodall Acts. And yet there is a worſe fault in this reaſon. For it is no more ſhewed that *Iohn* dyed before *Cyrill* by that Epiſtle, than by *Tullies ad Atticum*. That Epiſtle having neither date, nor any circumſtance to induce that, may as well bee written *Anno* 448. as *Anno* 440.

g *Bar. an. 444. nu. 16.*

h *To. 6. an. 440. nu. 9.*

21. His

21. His ſecond reaſon is this: *There are letters*, ſaith hee [i], *extant of Theodoret to Domnus the yeare following*, (to wit, *an.* 437.) *and that Epiſtle of Theodoret I will ſet downe in his due place, anno ſequenti, the next yeare.* Now in that next yeare, *viz. an.* 437. there is no Epiſtle of *Theodoret* ſet downe by the Cardinall, nor is either *Domnus* or *Theodoret* ſo much as named in all his diſcourſe of that yeare. Is not this now ſhewed *apertiſſimè*? you may bee ſure the Cardinall would not have feared to performe his promiſe, but that there was ſomewhat in that Epiſt. wch would have bewrayed his lewd dealing in this cauſe.

22. His third reaſon is drawne from the teſtimony of *Nicephorus* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*. This, ſaith hee [k], *exploratum habetur, is ſure and certaine by Nicephorus*. No, it is ſure and certaine by *Nicephorus* that *Baronius* is erronious in this matter; for *Nicephorus* [l] accounteth *Iohn* to have beene Biſhop of *Antioch* eighteene yeares, and the Cardinall [m] will allow him no more but thirteene, now the firſt yeare of *Iohn* cannot poſſibly be before the yeare 427. for in that year *Theodotus*, the next predeceſſor of *Iohn*, dyed, as *Baronius* [n] himſelfe proveth. Add now unto theſe ſeventeene moe, and then the death of *Iohn* by *Nicephorus* will bee *an.* 444. which is the ſelfe ſame yeare wherein *Cyrill* dyed. Is not this a worthy proofe to ſhew *Iohn* to have dyed ſeven years before *Cyrill*, as the *Cardinall* avoucheth that he did? Or do not you think the Cardinal was in ſome extaſy, to produce *Nicephorus* as a witneſſe for him, whereas *Nicephorus* (as the Cardinall himſelfe alſo confeſſeth) gives to *Iohn* 18. yeares, and the Cardinall allowes him but thirteene; and whereas the Cardinall of ſet purpoſe refuteth the account of *Nicephorus*?

23. But will you bee pleaſed to ſee how the Cardinall refuteth him? *Domnus*, ſaith hee [o], *was Biſhop of Antioch an.* 437. *as is proved by an Epiſtle of Theodorets written to Domnus in that yeare, which Epiſtle I will ſet downe in his due place, to wit, an.* 437. Lo, all his proofe is from that Epiſtle, which the Cardinall, contrary to his own promiſe, doth not, and, as I thinke, durſt not ſet downe.

24. But ſee further how the Cardinall is infatuated in this cauſe: *Iohn*, ſaith he [p], *dyed an.* 436. *having beene Biſhop* 13. *yeares. Iohn ſucceeded to* [q] *Theodotus, who dyed an.* 427. Say now in truth, is not the Cardinall a worthy Arithmetitian, that of 427. and 13. can make no more than 436? And is not this a worthy reaſon to refute *Nicephorus*? But this is not all, for *Baronius* [r] gloſſing upon *Theodorets* letter to *Dioſcorus*, which, as hee [ſ] ſaith, was written, *an.* 444. there obſerves with a *memorandum*, that by this paſſage of *Theodoret* you may ſee how long *Theodotus* [t], *Iohn*, and *Domnus* had ſitten in the See of *Antioch*, to wit, 26. yeares in all, from the time that *Theodoret* was made Biſhop unto that 444. yeare, *viz. Theodotus* 6. *Iohn* 13. and *Domnus* 7. untill that yeare *Theodoret*, as *Baronius* [u] will aſſure you, was made Biſhop, *an.* 423. Add now unto theſe ſix of *Theodotus*, thirteene of *Iohn*, and 7. of *Domnus*, and tell me whither you thinke the Cardinall had ſent his wits, when hee could ſumme theſe to bee juſt 444?

25. Or will you ſee the very quinteſſence of the Cardinals wiſedome? *I will*, ſaith he [x], *ſet downe the next yeare* (that is, *an.* 437.) *the very*

k Bar. *an.* 553. *nu.* 44.

l Νικηφορος ἐν τῳ Niceph. *in Chr.*

m *Johannes obiit cum ſediſſet annos* 13. *licet Nicephorus in Chronico tribuat ei* 18. Bar. *an.* 436. *nu.* 12.

n *Poſt hæc Theodotus ex hac vita migravit, qui ad hunc uſque annum pervenisſe proditur, &c.* Bar. *an.* 427. *nu.* 25.

o Bar. *an.* 436. *nu.* 12.

p Bar. *Ibid.*

q Bar. *an.* 427. *nu.* 26. *Defuncto Theodoto, ſubrogatus eſt in ejus locum Iohannes.*

r Bar. *an.* 444. *nu.* 23.

ſ *Theodoreti ad Dioſcorum data hoc anno Epiſtola ſic ſe habet.* An. *illo nu.* 18.

t *Hinc diſces annos cujuſque ipſorum Epiſcopatus.* Bar. *an.* 444. *nu.* 23.

u Bar. *an.* 423. *nu.* 10. *Hoc anno Theodoretus creatus eſt Epiſcopus.*

x Bar. *an.* 437. *nu.* 12.

very Epiſtle of Theodoret to Domnus, which was then written unto him; & eam quâ monſtratur, & I wil alſo ſet downe in his due place (to wit, *an.*444.) *that Epiſtle of Theodoret to Dioſcorus, whereby is ſhewed, that Iohn was Biſhop of Antioch juſt thirteene yeare.* Thus *Baronius*; who by theſe two Epiſtles of *Theodoret* will prove both theſe. As much in effect as if hee had ſaid, I have already [y] proved, that *Iohn* began to bee Biſhop of *Antioch an.*427. and this being ſet downe for a certainty: I will now prove by *Theodorets* Epiſtle to *Domnus*, that *Iohn* dyed *an* 436. that is, in his ninth yeare; and then I will prove againe by *Theodorets* Epiſtle to *Dioſcorus*, that hee dyed in his thirteenth yeare, and ſo dyed not till the yeare 440. Or, as if hee had thus ſaid, I will firſt prove, that mine owne Annals are untrue, wherin it is ſaid [z], that *Iohn* dyed in the yeare 436. which is but the ninth yeare of *Iohn*; becauſe he dyed not, as *Theodoret* in one Epiſtle [a] witneſſeth, untill his thirteenth yeare, which is *an* 440. And then I will prove unto you, that mine own Annals are again untrue, wherein it is ſaid [b], that *Iohn* was Biſhop thirteene yeare, and ſo dyed not till *an.* 440. (beginning the firſt, *an.*427) becauſe *Theodoret*, in another Epiſtle [c], witneſſeth, that *Iohn* dyed *an.*436. Or thus, I will firſt prove, that *Iohn* was dead *an.*436. though he was alive *an.* 440. and thē I will prove unto you, that *Iohn* was alive *an.*440. though he was dead *an.*436.

y *An.*417.*nu.*26

z *An.*436.*nu.* 12. *Hoc anno Iohannes diem obiit extremum.*

a *Theodor. Epiſt. ad Dioſc. apud Bar. an.*444.*nu.* 23. *Alios* 13. *tempore Johannis.*

b *Bar. an.*436. *nu.*12. *Johannes ſedit annos* 13.

c *Anno ſequenti* (*vid. an.*437.) *extant literæ Theodoreti ad ejus ſucceſſorem Domnum. Bar. an.*436.*nu.*12.

26. Is not this brave dealing in the Cardinall? is hee not worthy of a cap and a fether too, that can prove all theſe? and prove them by *Theodorets* Epiſtles? or doe you not think thoſe to be worthy Epiſtles of *Theodoret*, by which ſuch abſurdities, ſuch impoſſibilities may bee proved? Nay, doth not this alone, if there were no other evidence, demonſtrate thoſe Epiſtles of *Theodorets* to bee counterfeits? If that to *Domnus* be truly his, as *Baronius* aſſures [d] you, wherby *Iohn* is ſhewed to have dyed *an.*436. then certainly the other to *Dioſcorus* muſt needs bee a forgery, whereby *Iohn* is ſhewed to live *an.*440. Againe, if that to *Dioſcous* be truly his, as *Baronius* [e] aſſures you, wherin *Iohn* is ſaid to live *an.*440. then certainely the other to *Domnus* muſt of neceſſity bee a forgery, wherein *Iohn* is ſaid to be dead *an.*436. And as either of theſe two Epiſtles demonſtrates the untruth and forgery of the other, ſo they both demonſtrate the great vanity of *Baronius*, who applauds them both, & who wil make good what they both do affirm; that is, the ſame man to bee both dead and alive, a Biſhop and no Biſhop; at the ſelfe ſame time, and by theſe worthy reaſons doth the Cardinall refute his owne witneſſe *Nicephorus*, who by giving eighteene yeares to *Iohn*, ſhewes plainly that *Iohn* and *Cyrill* dyed within one yeare, which account perhaps gave occaſion to the exſcriber of the Synodall Acts to thruſt in the name of *Iohn*, whom, upon *Nicephorus* account hee thought to live after *Cyrill*, whereas in very deed hee dyed ſomewhile before *Cyrill*.

d *Extant literæ Theodoreti ad Domnum Bar. an.*436.*nu.*12.

e *Haſlenus Theodoreti ad Dioſc. Epiſtola Bar. an.* 440.*nu.*29.

27. His fourth and laſt reaſon is drawn from a Canonicall Epiſt. of *Cyrils* to *Domnus*, which is ſet done in the adjections to *Theodorus Balſamon*, whence it is out of all doubt, ſaith the Cardinall [f], *that Iohn dyed before Cyrill, ſeeing Cyrill writ unto his ſucceſſor Domnus*. But howſoever the Cardinall vanteth, that this reaſon will leave no doubt, yet, if you obſerve

f *Bar. an.*553. *nu.*44.

obſerve it, there are two great doubts therein: The former is, whether that Epiſtle be truly *Cyrils*: And beſides other reaſons, that one point which the Cardinall himſelfe mentioneth, may juſtly cauſe any to thinke it none of his; for as the Cardinall [g] ſaith, the Author of that Epiſtle aſcribes ſuch authority to *Domnus*, that he might *ad libitum, at his pleaſure put out Biſhops, and at his pleaſure reſtore them.* Now there is none that knowes the learning, moderation, and wiſedome of *Cyrill*, that can thinke *Cyrill* ever to have written in ſuch manner either to any Metropolitane, or to any Patriarke, ſpecially ſeeing *Cyrill* was not ignorant of that Canon of the Councell at *Antioch* [h], let not a Metropolitane doe any thing in ſuch cauſes, without the adviſe and conſent of the other Biſhops in the Province.

g *Nullus alius nomine Domnus inſcriptus legitur, qui tanta polleret authoritate ut ad libitum (quod dictū eſt) deponere atq; reſtituere Epiſcopos poſſet.* Bar. an. 553. nu. 44.

h *Conc. Antioch. ſub Iulio 1. can. 9.*

28. The other doubt is, whether that *Domnus*, to whom this Epiſtle is written, bee the ſame *Domnus* that was Biſhop of *Antioch*, and ſucceſſor to *Iohn*. The Cardinall is much troubled in removing this doubt, and hee windes himſelfe divers wayes. Sure it is, ſaith *Baronius* [i], *that hee who had ſuch authoritie muſt needs bee ſome eminent Biſhop, and not one of an inferior See.* True, but hee might bee a Metropolitane and ſo have inferiour Biſhops under him, and yet bee no Patriarke. Againe, ſaith hee [k], *There is no Domnus elſe but this Domnus Biſhop of Antioch, mentioned either in the Councell of Epheſus or Chalcedon, who had ſuch authority, as to depoſe and reſtore Biſhops, ad libitum.* As if *Domnus* of *Antioch* might doe it *ad libitum*: But in ſuch lawfull manner as *Domnus* of *Antioch* might doe it, there were others called by the name of *Domnus*, and thoſe mentioned in thoſe very Councels, who might upon juſt cauſe, and by due and Canonical proceeding depoſe and reſtore their inferiour Biſhops: looke but into thoſe Councels, and you will admire both the ſupine negligence of the Cardinall in this point, and his moſt audacious down-facing of the truth; for, to omit others, both in the Conventicle of *Epheſus*, and the Councell of *Chalcedon*, there is often mention of *Domnus* Biſhop of *Apamea*, a Metropolitane Biſhop, as the words of *Miletius* [l] doe witneſſe, *I Miletius Biſhop of Lariſſa, ſpeaking for Domnus the Metropolitane Biſhop of Apamea*; and for this *Domnus* hee ſubſcribed [m]. And that you may ſee how fraudulently the Cardinall dealt in this very point, he neither would ſet downe that Epiſtle, nor acquaint you with that which in *Balſamon* [n] is expreſly noted; that *Peter* the Biſh. whom that *Domnus*, unto whom *Cyrill* writeth, had depoſed, was *Alexandrinus Sacerdos, a Biſhop of the patriarchall dioceſſe of Alexandria*, what had *Domnus* of *Antioch* to doe with the Alexandrian Biſhops. So cleare it is by *Balſamon*, that this *Domnus*, unto whom *Cyrill* writ, was not *Domnus* of *Antioch*, as the Card. I feare againſt his knowledge, avoucheth,

i *Vnde apparet, non inferioris ſedis aliquem eſſe potuiſſe ejus nominis Epiſcopum. an. 553. nu. 44.*

k *Certè quidem in ſerie Epiſcoporum Orientalium, qui Concilio Epheſino, et Chalcedonenſi interfuerunt, nullus alius ejus nominis Domnus inſcriptus reperitur. &c. Ibid.*

l *Act. 3. Conc. Chal pa. 75. b.*

m *Act. eâdem pa. 81. et Act. 6. pa. 101. a.*

n *Sic enim in margine illius Epiſtolæ notatur, videtur tempore Cyrilli, emiſſa eſſe Romam, hujus Alexandrini Sacerdotis Appellatio.*

29. Thus you ſee all and every reaſon which the Cardinall bringeth *Iohn* to bee dead ſeven yeares before *Cyrill*, not only to be weake and unable to enforce that Concluſion, but withall to bee full fraught with frauds and untruths: So that if I had not found more ſound and certaine reaſons to perſwade this, I could never by the Cardinals prooſes have beene induced to thinke that an errour in the Inſcription of *Theodorets* Epiſtle. But ſeeing upon the undoubted teſtimonies

in the Councell of *Chalcedon* it is certaine, that *Iohn* dyed before *Cyrill*, I willingly acknowledge a ſlip of ſome writer in that Inſcription, but yet the Epiſtle it ſelfe muſt bee acknowledged truly to bee *Theodorets*, which is all that the Synod avoucheth, and which is that which the Cardinall undertooke to diſprove, but by no one reaſon doth offer to prove the ſame. And even for that errour alſo in the Inſcription I doubt not, but thoſe who can have the ſight of the Greek and Originall, yea, perhaps of ſome ancient Latine copies of the Acts of this fift Councell, ſhall finde either no name at all, or, which I rather ſuppoſe, the name of *Domnus* expreſſed therin; in ſtead of which, whereas ſome ignorant audacious exſcriber, hath thruſt in the name of *Iohn*; it is not, nor ought it to bee any impeachment at all to the Synodall Acts, unleſſe the Cardinall will acknowledge his owne Annals to bee of no credit, becauſe in them *Paſcalis* is written by ſome ſuch errour, for *Pelagius*, *Iohn* for *Vigilius*, *Iuſtinus* for *Iuſtinianus*, *Theodorus* for *Theodoſius*, *Sexta* for *Quinta*, *Fœlicianus* for *Celeſtianus*, and a number the like in other cauſes, moſt of theſe ſlips pertaining to this very cauſe of the *Three Chapters*, of which wee doe entreate.

Cap. XXXV.

That Baronius *himſelfe followeth many* forged writings, and fabulous narrations *in handling this cauſe of the fift Councell, as particularly* the excommunication aſcribed to *Mennas*, *Theodorus* and others, and the narration of *Anaſtaſius*.

1. YOV have ſeene all the exceptions which their great *Momus* could deviſe againſt theſe Acts, to prove them corrupted, either by alteration or mutilation, or, which is the worſt of all, by additions of forged writings. But alas, who can endure to heare *Baronius* declame againſt corrupted, falſe, forged, or counterfeit writings? *Quis tulerit Gracchos?* better might *Gracchus* invey againſt ſedition, or *Verres* againſt bribery, than *Baronius* againſt the uſing of falſe and fained writings. *Æthiopem albus derideat*, hee ſhould firſt have waſht away thoſe foule blemiſhes out of his owne Annals, more blacke herewith than any Æthiopian, and then have cenſured ſuch ſpots in others. Were his Annals well purged of ſuch writings, their vaſt Tomes would become a pretty Manuall: They who have occaſion to examine other paſſages in *Baronius* will finde the truth hereof in them; for this one concerning the fift Councell, Pope *Vigilius*, and the cauſe of the *Three Chapters*, from which I am loath to digreſſe, I doubt not, but whoſoever will compare the Cardinals Annals with this Treatiſe, wil eaſily perceive, that all which hee hath ſaid in defence of the Pope relyeth on no other nor better grounds, but either forged writings, or, if truely written by

by the authors, yet on some fabulous narration and untruths, which from them the Cardinall hath culd out, as onely fit for his purpose. Suffer me to give a tast hereof in some of them.

2. The first in this kinde is a supplication to *Vigilius*, or a briefe confession made unto him by *Mennas* Bishop of *Constantinople*, *Theodorus* Bishop of *Cæsarea*, and divers other Easterne Bishops, inserted in the beginning of the Constitution of *Vigilius*, and much applauded by the Cardinall [a] in this cause; and this to bee a meere fiction is by many evident proofes, before mentioned, easily discerned. The occasion of it, as the Cardinall tels us [b], was to humble themselves to Pope *Vigilius*, and acknowledge the injuries they had done in writing and declaming against [c] him, and his Synodall Constitution for Taciturnity concerning the *Three Chapters*. Now seeing that whole matter is fictitious, for neither was there any such Synod ever held, nor any such decree ever made; the confession which is grounded on them, must be like them, fabulous and forged.

a Bar. an. 550. nu. 19.

b *Ibid. et nu.* 20.

c *Vigilio non acquievit, sed eã plane despexit, eiq; insultavit, &c.* Ba. an. 551 nu 3.

3. The contents bewray the dulnesse of the forgerer; the Easterne Bishops professe there, to imbrace the foure former Councels, and all the Acts thereof, in all causes, judgements and Constitutions, made with consent [d] of the Popes Legates. Why? the Easterne Bishops knew right well, that some Canons were concluded both in the Councells of *Constantinople* and *Chalcedon*, not only without, but quite contrary to the minde of the Pope and his Legates, as namely, that about the dignity of *Constantinople*, which they, notwithstanding the resistance of the Legates, both approved and knew it to have beene ever held in force by the judgement of the Catholike Church, but specially by the Bishops of *Constantinople*, whose Patriarchall dignity, which they ever after the second Councell enjoyed, was both decreed and confirmed by those Canons. Never did the Easterne Bishops in those dayes, nor long after, esteeme the Popes owne, much lesse his Legates consent, so necessary to any Synodall Decree, but that without them the same might bee made and stand in force as the judgement of the generall Councell and whole Church. And to goe no further, what an unlikely and uncredible thing is it, that *Theodorus* and the rest in one yeare should make this confession to accept no more of those Synodall decrees, then the Pope or his Legates were pleased to allow; and the very next yeare after, contrary to that their confession, themselves hold a Synod, and make a Synodall decree in this cause of the *Three Chapters*, not onely without the Popes consent, or presence either of himself or his Legate, but even contrary to his *definitive* sentence made known unto them? the deviser of that confession shewes himselfe plainely to have beene some of the Vaticane favourites, who living perhaps in the time of *Gregory*, by this intended to infringe the dignity of the See of *Constantinople*, and those Canons which were concluded both in the 2. and 4. Councell, whereas the Easterne Bishops notwithstanding the contradiction and resistance of the Pope held them ever in as great authority and reverence, as any Canons in all the foure former Councels.

d *Universa ab eisdem Synodis communi consensu cum Vicariis sedis Apostolicæ judicia conservamus, &c. in Exemplo confess. quod extat in initio Constituti Vigily.*

4. Againe what a silly devise was it to make *Mennas*, *Theodorus*, and

and a great number of Biſhops to aske pardon of the Pope for that wherein they profeſſe themſelves no way to bee guilty? *I have* [c] *done no injuries to your Holineſſe*, yet for the peace of the Church, *veluti ſi eas feciſſem veniam poſtulo, I pray you forgive mee that which I never did, as if I had done it.* Can any man thinke this the ſubmiſſion of wiſe men, of ſuch ſtout and conſtant mindes as *Mennas* and *Theodorus*, beſides the reſt, had? or what could bee deviſed more repugnant to that which *Vigilius* is made to ſay in his excommunication [f] of *Theodorus*, *Thou ſcandalizing the whole Church, and being warned, entreated, threatned by me, haſt refuſed to amend: & nunquam à pravâ intentione ceſſaſti, and never haſt thou ceaſed from thy wicked deſigne, nor to write and preach novelties*, (ſo he cals the condemning of the *Three Chapters*) *yea, after the Conſtitution for ſilence, to which thou hadſt ſworne, thou haſt openly read in the Pallace a booke againſt the Three Chapters; thou haſt beene the firebrand and the beginner of the whole ſcandall, thou haſt deſpiſed the authority of the Apoſtolike See.* Thus ſaith the Excommunication. Was *Vigilius* well adviſed, thinke you, to accept, as a ſatisfaction and ſubmiſſion for ſo many and ſo hainous crimes of inſolency, contempt, perjury, ſacriledge, and the like, this confeſſion at the hands of *Theodorus*, wherein he doth in effect give the Pope the lie, ſaying and avouching, I have written no bookes at all contrarie to that Decree of Silence made by your Holineſſe, and for the injuries which have beene done to your holineſſe, and to your See, *eas quidem non feci, truely I have done none at all.* Is not this a worthy ſubmiſſion? the Pope ſaith, he hath done innumerable and very hainous injuries to him, ſuch as deſerved the cenſure of excommunication: No, ſaith *Theodorus*, I have done none at all unto him: and this the Pope, like a wiſe man, takes for a good ſatisfaction [g], or an humble ſubmiſſion upon which hee is preſently reconciled, and ſhakes hands with that capitall offender. Or where was the Cardinals judgment when he ſaith [h] of this confeſſion, that in it *Theodorus* did *ſupplicitèr*, humbly intreat pardon of *Vigilius*, *de irrogatis in ipſum probris & contumelijs, for the ſcoffes and contumelies which hee had uſed againſt the Pope.* If this confeſſion was true and reall, then certainly the Excommunication of *Vigilius* is not only moſt unjuſt, but a very fooliſh fiction: If the Excommunication was true and reall, then muſt needs this ſubmiſſion bee fained and fictitious. True they cannot bee both, but that both ſhould be falſe and counterfaits, is not onely poſſible, but certaine.

5. If nothing elſe, the time when this Confeſſion was made by *Theodorus* and *Mennas* demonſtrates this. It was made after the Decree [i] of *Taciturnity*, and the Synod wherein that was concluded, and that was indeed never: that decree and Synod are meerely *Chymericall*, this Confeſſion then made after them, and mentioning that decree, cannot poſſibly be reall: It was made, as the Cardinall [k] aſſures us, after that *Vigilius*, fleeing the perſecution of *Iuſtinian*, had fled, firſt, to Saint *Peters* in *Conſtantinople*, then to the Church of *Enthennia* at *Chalcedon*; yea, after that the Emperour had revoked and abrogated his Edict againſt the *Three Chapters*, and *Vigilius*, at the earneſt intreaty of the Emperour, was now returned from *Chalcedon* to *Conſtantinople*;

[c] *De injurijs beatitudini veſtræ factis, ego quidè nullam feci, &c. Ibid.*

[f] *Actat inter Epiſt. Vigilij poſt Epiſtolam 16.*

[g] *Tali præmiſſâ ſatisfactione Vigilius eoſdem in communionem accepit. Bar. an. 552. nu. 20.*

[h] *An. eodem nu. 19.*

[i] *Bar. an. 551. nu. 3. et 552. nu. 19.*

[k] *Bar. an. 552. nu. 8 et ſeq.*

ple: and this was at Nevermaſſe: neither did *Iuſtinian* perſecute *Vigilius*, neither did *Vigilius* for feare of his perſecution flee either to S. *Peters*, or to *Chalcedon*, neither did *Iuſtinian* intreat him to returne from thence, whither hee fled not at all, nor ever did the Emperour adnull or revoke his *Edict* againſt the *three Chapters:* then certainly the confeſſion w^ch^ by the Cardinalls own profeſſion & acknowledgement followed all theſe, muſt needs be like them, a fiction and meere forgery, never really & truly made by *Mennas*, *Theodorus*, and the reſt of thoſe Biſhops. Laſtly, it was made the next yeare before the fift Councell was held, that is, *anno* 552. which is the twenty ſixt of *Iuſtinian*, as the Cardinall witneſſeth [l]; before which time it cannot bee imagined to have beene made; for the excommunication of *Theodorus* was publiſhed but in that yeare in which *Vigilius* came to *Chalcedon*, as *Baronius* [m] confeſſeth. Now it is a riddle which *Oedipus* cannot diſſolve, how *Mennas*, who, as wee have certainly proved by the Acts of the ſixt Councell, dyed in the 21. yeare of *Iuſtinian*, ſhould come now in his 26. yeare, that is, foure or five yeares after his death, to offer up a ſupplication to *Vigilius*, and aske pardon of him for doing no offence againſt him. Me thinkes either the Pope ſhould be afrighted with ſuch a gaſtly ſight, or *Baronius* aſhamed to applaud ſuch ſottiſh fictions, as is that excommunication of *Mennas* made by *Vigilius:* and the *Encyclycall* Epiſtle of *Vigilius*, which mentions and approves that excommunication, and this forged confeſſion; none of which will ſuffer the ghoſt of *Mennas* ro reſt, but bring a dead man out of his grave, to heare the Popes ſentence thundred out againſt him, and then come with a bill of ſupplication to beg forgiveneſſe of his Holineſſe, who had more reaſon to have prayed pardon of *Mennas* for diſquieting and waking him out of that long and ſound ſleepe.

l Anno illo 552. nu. 19.

m *Hæc de ſententiâ in Theodorum ac Mennam lata Vigilius, quæ ipſe ſcripſit anno ſequenti in Baſilica S. Euphemiæ Chalcedone. Bar. an. 551. nu. 18.*

6. So both the occaſion, the contents, and the time, beſides other circumſtances, doe evidently convince that ſubmiſſion to bee a counterfeit. But how comes it then into the Popes *Conſtitution*? You muſt enquire this of *Baronius*, or of thoſe who have acceſſe to the Vaticane whence this *Conſtitution* was taken: might one have the ſight of the Vaticane copy, I doubt not but either there are ſome evident prints of error, in inſerting this confeſſion into it; or which I exceedingly miſtruſt, *Baronius* hath uſed a little of the Vaticane art in this matter. Howſoever, certaine it is that this confeſſion hath neither fit coherence, nor any dependence at all of ought in the Conſtitution, but it is both complete and much more orderly, this being wholly expunged, than if ſo idle a fiction be annexed unto it. But let the Cardinall and his friends looke to this matter by what meanes or whoſe fraud this was inſerted, I thought needfull to admoniſh thē of the fault, nor for the love and affection I beare to that Conſtitution of *Vigilius*, could I with ſilence ſee and ſuffer it to be blemiſhed therewith.

7. The ſecond is *Euſtathius*, of whom I would have ſpoken more in this place, but that his fained and fabulous narrations are ſo clearly diſcovered before, that I thinke it needleſſe to adde ought concerning him, or them.

8. The third writing is a book in very great requeſt with *Baronius*, and

and that is, thoſe Epiſtles which beare the name of *Theodoret*, of which though much hath beene ſayd before, yet will I here adde ſomewhat to manifeſt them further to bee counterfeit and moſt falſe. Among them, two are moſt eminent; that to *Dioſcorus*, and the other to Pope *Leo*. That the former is forged, the other doth demonſtrate. For by that to *Dioſcorus* which was writ *anno* 444. *Theodoret* is made to ſay, that he had then beene Biſhop 26. yeares [n], whereas by the later written *anno* 449. it is cleare that in that yeare he had beene Biſhop, no more [o] than 26. yeares. So *vice verſa*, that the later is forged is demonſtrated by the former; for by that to *Leo* written *an.* 449. *Theodoret* is made to ſay that he had then beene Biſhop juſt 26. whereas by the other to *Dioſcorus* written *anno* 444. it is witneſſed that hee had beene Biſhop 26. [p] yeares, five yeares before he writ to *Leo*. And they are both demonſtrated to be meere fictitious, in that *Theodoret* is made in them both to teſtifie that for that whole time of 26. yeares he had beene orthodoxall in faith, and for prooſe thereof he appeales [q] to his owne writings, written 12. 15. and 20. yeares before that; whereas it is as cleare as the Sunne that hee was a moſt earneſt defender and writer in defence of *Neſtorius* and his hereſies, and for this cauſe was juſtly condemned by the holy Counceil of *Epheſus*, yea and his writings yet extant [r] doe undenyably convince the ſame. Beſides in that to *Dioſcorus*, hee profeſſeth [s] his ardent affection and love to *Cyrill*, whereas after *Cyrils* death, in an open aſſembly at *Antioch* he moſt bitterly [t], unjuſtly, and ſpitefully declamed againſt him. Further, in that to *Dioſcorus*, it is ſaid that he was orthodoxall [u] *anno* 444. when that Epiſtle was written; whereas in his Epiſtle written *anno* 448. [x] or after, unto *Irene* a Neſtorian Biſhop of *Tyre*, juſtly depoſed [y] by the Emperour, he bemones both the publike cauſe and the caſe of *Irene*, comparing his to the cauſe [z] of *Suſanna*, and lamenting that either [a] they muſt offend God, and hurt their owne conſcience, (if they forſake Neſtorianiſme,) or elſe fall into unjuſt decrees and puniſhments of men, (if they continued in that doctrine;) and who further calls this deposed and hereticall Biſhop, *Dilectiſſimum* [b], *& piiſſimum Irenæum, The moſt beloved, and moſt holy Irene.* The like forgery might be ſhewed in his Epiſtle to *Nomus*, written alſo *anno* 448. [c] wherein hee exclameth againſt the Emperor *Theodoſius*, as if he had given toleration [d] & free liberty of Religion to Arians, Eunomians, Manichees, Marcionites, Valentinians, & Mõtaniſts, & yet reſtrained yea excluded him *ab omni civitate, from every City in his Empire*; which to bee a moſt vile and unjuſt ſlander, the piety and zeale of *Theodoſius*, highly renowned both by *Sozomen* [e], and Pope *Leo* [f] doth demonſtrate; and whoſe [g] Edicts againſt heretikes do alſo manifeſt the ſame, ſeeing therein out of his hatred to hereſie, and ſpecially to Neſtorianiſme, he forbids any [h] ſuch to

n *Apud Bar. an. 444. nu. 23.*
o *Cum 26. annis Eccleſiam rexerim. Theod. apud Bar. an. 449. nu. 119.*
p *Apud Bar. an. 444. nu. 23.*
q *In Epiſt. ad Leonem. apud Bar. an. 449. nu. 120. A me enim ſcripta ſunt alia quidem ante annos viginti, &c.*
r *Extant tom. 5. act. Conc. Epheſ. pa. 859. et ſequ. ſub hoc titulo. Reprehenſio 12. Capitulorum Cyrilli, à Theodoreto Epiſcopo Cyri.*
s *Hominem ſumus admirati, et ſcripſimus ad Cyrillum beatæ memoriæ, &c. Theod. apud Bar. an. 444. nu. 28.*
t *Theodoreti alloquutio, apud Conc. 5. Coll. 5. p. 559. b.*
u *Ego multas habeo myriadas hominum qui doctrinæ veritatem et rectitudinem mihi teſtantur. Theod. apud Bar. an. 444. nu. 22.*
x *Literæ quæ à Theodoreto ad Irenæum tunc (id eſt, ut ipſe explicat, hoc anno 448.) redditæ ſunt. Bar. an. 440. nu. 78.*
y *Statuimus ut Irenæus à ſanctis Tyriorum Eccleſiâ ſtatim expellatur. Edict. Theodoſ. quod extat to. 5. Conc. Epheſ. ca. 19.*
z *Beatiſſimæ Suſannæ ſum recordatus, &c. Theod. epiſt. ad Iren. apud Bar. an. 448. nu. 9.*
a *Et nunc Domine duo nobis proponuntur, vel Deum offendere et conſcientiam ladere, vel incidere in injuſta hominum decreta, &c. Theod. ibid.*
b *Epiſtola eâdem.*
c *Illa Theodoreti Epiſtola ſcripta ad Nomum hoc ipſo anno. Bar. an. 448 nu. 11.*
d *Aliis quidem omnibus aperta eſt civitas, non ſolum Arij et Eunomij ſectatoribus, ſed et Manichæis, et Marcioniſtis, &c. Theod. epiſt. ad Nomum. apud Bar. an. 448. nu. 12.*
e *Nullam non virtutis genus ſedulo excoluiſti, &c. ſic Theodoſium junieres alloquitur Sozom. in præfat. ad ſuam hiſtor.*
f *Piiſſimam ſollicitudinem Chriſtianæ religionis habetis, ut in populo Dei aut ſchiſmata, aut hereſes, aut ulla ſcandala convaleſcant. Leo. epiſt. 7. quæ eſt ad Theodoſium.*
g *Leg. 66. de hær. cod. Theod. et id quod extat in Conci. Chal. act. 3. pa. 84.*
h *Definivimus omnes extorres debere ulterioribus ſubjacere, &c. Edict. Theod. in Conc. Chalc. loc. cit.*

enjoy

enjoy their Sees, or to scape unpunished; and being misinformed that *Flavianus* and *Eusebius* of *Dorileum* were Nestorians, hee upon that misinformation, unjustly and rashly subjected [i] them to that censure; but being truly enformed of *Domnus* and *Theodoret*, that they embraced Nestorianisme, he justly confirmed their deposition, forbidding any either to reade or have the bookes or *Theodoret* [k], or of *Nestorius*, *Theodorets* being every whit as bad as the bookes of *Nestorius*. It were easie to shew the like prints of forgery in all those Epistles going under the name of *Theodoret*, which the Cardinall so much magnifieth: but I am loth to stay too long in them, the falshood of which hath beene so often before demonstrated.

i *Excludi ab Episcopatu (volumus) Flavianum & Eusebium, Domnumque & Theodoretum. ibid.*

k *Sed nec habeat quis, vel legat, proferatve, Nestorij codices, neque Theodoreti scripta. ibid.*

9. A fourth is that Action concerning *Domnus*, inserted by *Baronius* and *Binius* into the Acts of the Councell [q] at Chalcedon. This to be undoubtedly a forgery and fiction, was before proved, because *Domnus* was dead before the Councell at *Chalcedon*; for so both the Emperour *Iustinian* [r] in his *Edict*, and the fift Councell [s] expresly witnesse, saying, the holy Councell at *Chalcedon* condemned *Domnus, post mortem, after he was dead*, for that he durst write that the twelve chapters of *Cyrill* should not be spoken of. Now that whole Action containing nothing else but a consultation and decree for the maintenance of *Domnus*, by some annuall allowance out of the revenewes of the See of Antioch, none I thinke will once imagine that so grave, so wise and worthy an assembly of 603. Bishops, would either consult or make a decree for the allowance of a stipend or maintenance to be given to a dead man: specially not to *Domnus*, whose deposition in the Ephesine latrociny the whole Councell of *Chalcedon* approved: and it is very unlikely they would judge him worthy to have maintenance out of that Bishopricke, of which by reason of his heresie they judged him most justly to bee deprived. But if there were no other reasons to manifest this, the place whence it comes might justly cause one to distrust the same: for is it thinke you in the Greeke and originall copies of that Councell? No certainly, it is not: as both the Cardinall [t] and *Binius* will assure you; *Desideratur in Græco, it is wanting in the Greeke or originall:* nor onely is it now wanting there, but *certum est eadem caruisse Græca exemplaria tempore Iustiniani; It is certaine the Greeke copies had not this Action in the time of Iustinian the Emperour.* Is it mentioned in *Liberatus*? or in *Evagrius*? or in *Nicephorus*? all which set downe the summe of the Actions in that Councell? No, it is not in any of them. Whence then comes this worthy action that so carefully provides victuals for a dead man? Truly out of their old Minthouse the Vaticane: *Hæc Actio scripta in Latino veteri codice Vaticano: There is in the Vaticane an old manuscript Latine copie*, which is sayd to have beene the copy of *Albinius* and *Proculus*, and in that old written booke, this Action is found, saith *Baronius* [u]. A very *Gibeonite* you may be sure. It came with old moulded bread, (such as was fittest to feed a dead man) with old mouldy shooes and torne clothes, and so deceived the Cardinall: No, it deceived him not, but by it hee would deceive others, and not onely most shamefully deprave and corrupt the Acts of the holy Councell of *Chalcedon*, as hee and *Binius* have

q *Conc. Chalc. Act. 7.*

r *Iust. Edict. to. 2. Conc. pa. 498.*

s *Con. 6 p. 575. b.*

t *Hæc actio desideratur in Græco codice. Bar. an. 451. nu. 129. & Bin. not. in Conc. Chal. p. 185*

u *an. 451. n. 130*

done herein, but make a way, and ſhew an occaſion to carpe at the Synodall Acts of the fift Councell: and had not the Cardinall beene conſcious of this fault in this Action, you may be well aſſured that he would not have omitted ſo foule an errour in the fift Synod, and the Acts thereof, as to avouch *Domnus* to have beene dead before the Councell of *Chalcedon*, when hee ſcraped and raked together all that he could finde (and they are all but motes to this beame) whereby he might diſgrace thoſe Acts.

10. But the Cardinall will not for all this yeeld in this matter, nay he will defend this Action alſo: *For objecting* [x] *to himſelfe how any ſuch Action could be held concerning Domnus, ſeeing Iuſtinian teſtifieth hee was dead before the Councell of Chalcedon, hee anſwereth, Iuſtinian was ignorant of this Action, and he had ſome other Action of the Councell of Chalcedon touching Domnus, Quam nuſquam legimus, Which we no where finde.* So *Baronius*: Who hereby would have it thought, that *Iuſtinian* and the fift Councell had not the true Copies of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, but that theſe which the Cardinall frameth, they are the onely perfect and entire Acts thereof. Certainly *Iuſtinian* was ignorant of this Action, and ſo was the fift Councell. And no marvell, when the Councell of *Chalcedon* it ſelfe was ignorant thereof. And whether the Emperour and the whole fift generall Councell, wherein were preſent foure Patriarkes, and the Biſhop of *Chalcedon* alſo, whether theſe living about an hundred yeares after that Councell, bee not like to have had more true Copies of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, than *Baronius*, living eleven hundred yeares after it, it is not hard to judge.

x an. 451. n. 130

11. Now for that which the Cardinall would perſwade, that whereas *Iuſtinian* and the fift Synod ſayd, that the Councell of *Chalcedon* condemned *Domnus* after he was dead, they ſayd this, as he ſuppoſeth, out of ſome other Action [y] of *Chalcedon*, which is not now extant, and thereby would blemiſh the Acts of the Councell of *Chalcedon* as being defective, and wanting that Action: Truly his Cardinalſhip is foully miſtaken herein. Neither *Iuſtinian*, nor the fift Councell, had any ſuch Action, as he vainly and idlely dreameth of. It was theſe very Acts which now wee have, out of which they affirme that. For they ſay not that the Councell did that in any action particularly concerning *Domnus*, nor yet that in expreſſe termes they condemned *Domnus*: But they ſay, the Councell condemned him, and ſo they did, in that they approved both his condemnation and depoſition decreed in the Epheſine Latrociny. That this they did the acts now extant doe declare; whereas [a] the moſt holy Biſhops of *Rome* accounted all that was done in the ſecond Epheſine Synod to be void, it is manifeſt that the judgement concerning the Biſhop of *Antioch* is excepted; ſo ſayd the Popes *Legates*, and *Stephen* [b], *I alſo judge thoſe things to be voyd which were done at Epheſus, abſque his quæ geſta ſunt adverſus Domnum, excepting thoſe things which were done againſt Domnus*: and to the like effect ſayd they all. *Domnus* then being dead, at the time of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, and having beene in the Epheſine Latrociny, both condemned and depoſed, ſeeing the Councell of *Chalcedon* approved both his condemnation and depoſition, and the ſub-

y *Ex quibus apparet Juſtinianum alicujus alterius actionis, quam nuſquam legimus, cognitionem habuiſſe.* Bar. loc. cit.

a *Act.* 10. pa. 115.

b *Ibid.*

substitution of *Maximus*, (which were all done in that Ephesine Latrociny,) as just and lawfull: hence it is that the fift Councell sayth, and that out of these very Acts and no other, as themselves explaine, that [c] the Fathers at *Chalcedon* condemned *Domnus* being dead, whose condemnation they approved, when at that time of their approving it hee was dead. So neither are the Acts of the fourth Councell imperfect, nor these of the fift untrue, in affirming this of *Domnus*; but that Vatieane and Gibeonitish Action, inserted into the Acts of *Chalcedon*, and approved by *Baronius* and *Binius*, is both false, ridiculous, and impossible.

c *Chalcedonenses Synodus Domnum condemnavit, cum confirmasset condemnationem ejus, & suscepisset Maximi ordinationem.* Conc. 5. Coll. 6. pa. 575.

12. The last whom I will now mention, is *Anastasius*, the writer of the lives of their Popes. An author whom *Baronius* much followeth, and relyeth upon, almost in all parts of his Annals: whom I doe not mention in this place, as doubting whether those lives are truly his, but as doubting, nay rather without doubt assuring both my selfe and others, that such credit is not to bee given to him and to his reports, as the Cardinall and *Binius* doe give. This I doubt not to demonstrate, if ever I come to handle the second Nicene Synod, and that which they call the eighth, wherein *Anastasius* was a stickler, yea and the penner of the one, and corrector of the other: For this present, I will onely examine the life of *Vigilius* written by him; wherein I doe constantly affirme, that there are not so many lines as lyes set downe by *Anastasius*. Which that it may appeare that I doe not speake in any spleene against *Anastasius*, but out of the evidence of truth, give me leave to take a view of some particulars therein, those especially which most concerne this our present cause.

13. First, *Anastasius* [d] describing the entrance of *Vigilius* to have beene *eodem tempore*, at that time when *Belisarius* made warre against *Vitiges* the King of the *Gothes*, sayth that *Vitiges fled away by night, but Iohn surnamed the bloody, pursued after him, and brought him to Belisarius and Vigilius at Rome; and there Belisarius tooke the Sacrament to bring him safe to Iustinian.* All untrue. First, it is untrue that *Vitiges* fled away by night; or secondly, that hee fled at all; or thirdly, that *Iohn* did pursue him in flight; or fourthly, that *Iohn* tooke him; or fiftly, that *Iohn* brought him to *Belisarius*; or sixtly, that hee brought him to *Vigilius*; or seventhly, that he brought him to Rome; or eightly, that *Belisarius* tooke any such oath; or ninthly, any Sacrament; or tenthly, tooke it in the Church of *Iulius*; or eleventhly, tooke it to assure them that hee would bring *Vitiges* to *Iustinian*: all these are the fictions of *Anastasius*. For as *Procopius* who was Counsellor [e] to *Belisarius*, and present with him in all his warres, testifieth, *Vitiges* and the Gothes willingly yeelded [f] themselves and Ravenna unto *Belisarius*, yea *Vitiges* perswaded and even entreated him to accept the kingdome: and *Belisarius* tooke *Vitiges* [g] himselfe, and kept him in custody: yea he sent away *Iohn* [h] and *Narses* before either he entred in *Ravenna*, or tooke *Vitiges*, and being taken, he car-

d *Anast. in vita Vigil. Nam Anastasius continuavit historiam Damas. ab obitu Damasi usque ad Adrianum secundum.* Possev. in App.

e *Belisarii Consiliarus adfuit Procopius, & rebus omnibus dum agerentur interfuit.* Procop. lib. 1. *de bello Persico.*

f *Gothorum Optimates Belisarium Hesperia Regem appellare constituunt, ad eumq; mittunt qui obsecrarent ut imperium susciperet. Vitiges quoque formidine perculsus Belisario ipse ad servitium confugit. Proc. lib. 2. Bell. Goth. pa. 340. qui paulo post quomodo se turpiter dediderunt Vitiges et Gothi declarat: idem docet Leon. Aret. lib. 1. de bello Ital. pa. 469.*

g *Belisarius Ravennæ potitus Vitigem imperii honorifice custodiæ servabat. ibid. pa. 341.*

h *Belisarius Iohannem & Narsetem diversis ubique cum suis copiis misit. His abeuntibus Ravennam contendit. ib. p. 340. idem et Leon. Aret. hoc etiam.*

ed him not to *Rome*, but the ſtraight way by Sea to [i] *Conſtantinople*, whither himſelfe was then [k] called by the Emperour, and commanded to come without any delay. So in the very entrance of his narration, *Anaſtaſius* hath in few words couched together at the leaſt ten or eleven evident untruths.

14. Next, *Anaſtaſius relates, how the Emperour and his wife demanded of Belliſarius when he came to Conſtantinople, how he had placed Vigilius in ſtead of Silverius, and thanked him for it.* Truly *Anaſtaſius* had ſmall wit to thinke that the Emperour had leaſure to confer with *Belliſarius* concerning a matter done about three [l] yeares before: and ſpecially which with the death of *Silverius* [m] was now dead and buried. Yet ſay he did. Againe, what an idle diſcourſe was this about the placing of *Vigilius* in the roome of *Silverius*, ſeeing the Emperour knew the whole matter long before, how *Silverius* was baniſhed, upon an accuſation of a Letter written to the Gothiſh King, to come and take poſſeſſion of Rome, and himſelfe had taken order that the cauſe of *Silverius* ſhould be againe examined, and if that letter was truly writ by *Silverius*, that he ſhould be baniſhed; if it were found a calumny, that he ſhould bee reſtored, as *Liberatus* [n] ſheweth. Hee knew [o] alſo that *Silverius* was dead, and that *Vigilius* was peaceably and with his conſent placed in the Romane See before *Belliſarius* came, for hee had written [p] unto him as the onely lawfull Pope, and both the Emperour and *Mennas* had received Letters [q] from him the yeare [r] before. But *Anaſtaſius* thought the Emperours diſcourſes to bee as idle as his owne. Beſides, whereas he addes that the Emperour thanked him for placing of *Vigilius* in the roome of *Silverius*; *Binius* is bould therein to tell *Anaſtaſius* of his untruth, ſeeing all that, as he ſaith [b], was done without the knowledge of *Juſtinian*, by the plotting of *Theodora*. I will account theſe for no more than two untruths.

15. After this, *Anaſtaſius* tels us that *Juſtinian* then ſent *Belliſarius* againe into *Africke*, who comming thither killed by trechery *Gontharis* King of the *Vandalls*, and then comming to Rome offered ſome of the ſpoiles of the *Vandalls* to Saint Peter by the hands of Pope *Vigilius*, to wit, a Croſſe of gold beſet with precious ſtones, being a hundred pound in waight, wherin were writ his victories, two great ſilver tables guilded, which unto this day ſtand, ſaith hee, before the body of Saint Peter: alſo hee gave many other gifts, and many almes to the poore, and built an hoſpitall in the broad way, and a Monaſtery of Saint Juvenalis at the City of Orta, where hee gave poſſeſſions, and many gifts. Thus *Anaſtaſius*, whoſe narration as is muſt needs teſtifie in what great honour the Romane Church was in thoſe ancient times, and how bountifull they were then unto it, ſo may it ſerve for an incentive to inflame the zeale of Emperours, and great perſons to doe the like after their victories and conquests, and no doubt but by ſuch lyes and fables as this is, their Church had gained the beſt part of her treaſures and poſſeſſions; for all this not one ſyllable is true or probable. *Belliſarius* when hee came to *Conſtantinople*

i *Belliſ. iter aggreditur, Byzantiumq́, rectâ contendit. ibid. pa. 343. et cum Vitige Gothorumq́, optimatibus Byzantium venit. Idem lib. 3. pa. 343. Belliſarius cum Vitige Byzantium navigavit. Leo. Aret. loc. cit.*

k *Belliſario ad ſe celerius vocato. Proc. lib. 2. pa. 341. et Leonar. Aret. pa. 670. Juſtinianus Belliſarium ex Italia confeſtim revocavit.*

l *Nam Silverii à Belliſario electum narrat. Proc. lib. 1. pa. 287. eiq́, tum ſuffectus Vigilius. ibid. Id factum an. 3. belli Goth. vel ante, liquet ex lib. 2. pa. 313. ubi ſic ait, Iam tertium bello huic annus exibat.*

m *Nam Silverius obiit an. 14. Juſtiniani Bar. an. 540. n. 2. at Vitigem cepit et Conſtantinopol. eduxit Belliſarius an. 15. Juſtiniani Bar. an. 541. nu. 3.*

n *Liber. in Brev. ca. 22.*

o *Hoc anno (14. Juſtiniani) ſimulac de legitima Vigilii electione nuncium Conſtantinopol. perlatum eſt, Imperator protinus Epiſtolam ad eum dat. Bar. an. 540. nu. 11.*

q *Epiſt. Vigilii extat apud Bar. an. 540. nu. 20. & ſeqq.*

r *Nam literæ ad Mennam datæ ſunt 15. Kalend. Oct. Juſtino Conſule, id eſt, an. 14. Juſtiniani Bar. ad 540. nu. 25. Belliſarius autem Conſtantinopol. redit Conſul. Baſilio, id eſt, an. 15. Juſtin. Bar. an. 541. n. 3.*

b *Patet quod vult Imperator Belliſarium hac de cauſa gratioſum non fuiſſe Bin. Not. in vitam Pelag. 2. Gratian.*

with *Vitiges* was not then sent into the West, but into *Persia* [t] against *Cosroes*, as *Procopius*, who was present with him, testifieth, and in those warres hee continued full three [u] yeares: When hee was sent Westward hee was not sent into *Africk*, for thither *Ariobindus* [x] was sent, with whom was sent *Artabanus*: Neither did *Belisarius* either by villany or victory kill *Gontharis*, but *Artabanus* killed [y] him treacherously when they sat together at a feast in *Gontharis* Chamber: nor came *Belisarius* from *Africk* to *Rome*, (for after his second comming (which was from *Constantinople*) into *Italy*, he stayed there till his returne to *Bizantium* five [z] yeares after, and returned backe no more [a]) nor brought hee thence with him any of the spoyles of the Vandales; nor offered hee them to Saint *Peter*; nor offered he, by the hand of *Vigilius* either that golden Crosse of an hundred pound waight (which is a golden lye, consisting of an hundred latchets) nor the silver table, nor those many other gifts, nor built he an Hospitall, nor gave hee either possessions or donations. All these, if they be well summed, will make at least twelve grand capitall mother lyes, which have many moe in their wombs; such an art of devising untruths hath *Anastasius*. Or if this oblation bee referred, as *Binius* [b] saith perhaps it ought, to the time when *Belisarius* wanne *Rome* from *Vitiges*, which was, as *Procopius* [c] sheweth in the third yeare of the warres against the *Gothes*, and 12. of *Justinian*, yet this can excuse no one of all the untruths of *Anastasius*; for neither then was *Vigilius* but *Sylverius* [d] the Pope, neither did *Belisarius* then come out of *Africk*, or bring the spoyles of the Vandals with him, of which this oblation was made by the hands of Pope *Vigilius*.

16. Next to this, *Anastasius* saith, *eodem tempore Theodora scripsit, at that same time Theodora the Empresse writ to Vigilius to come to Constantinople, and restore Anthimus to his See; but Vigilius refused, saying, I spake foolishly before when I promised that, but now I can no way consent to restore an heretike:* Whence *Baronius* [e] observes a rare miracle, that *Vigilius* was now turned to a new man, & now *Saul* was one of the Prophets, of a blasphemer chāged to a true Preacher, of a *Saul* into a *Paul*; all wch change proceeded from his very sitting in the Popes Chaire, *momento temporis novam formam accepit, at that very moment* when he became the true Pope, *hee had a new forme, a new speech*, and then professed consonantly to the fathers: and the like miracle doth *Binius* [f] note, *statim ut sanctam sedem ascendit, as soone as ever Vigilius had stept into the holy Chaire*, hee was wholly changed into a new man, and then condemned the heresies, which before hee approved. A right *Neanthes* indeed, of whom it is written, that before being ὄρος ἐπὶ νέον, having

t *Belisarius Vitigem captivum eo tempore Bizantium duxit quando Iustinianus Cosroem audivit bellum moviſſe. Proc. lib. 2. Bell. Pers. pa. 156. Imperator rei Orientis in duos diduxit duces circa fluvium Euphratem omnia Belisario tradidit regenda. Ibid. pa. 158.*

u *Totilus cum exercitus parte ad lecta Romæ vicina cōtendit, cujus profectione cognita, Imperator, etsi adhuc fortissimè sibi insistētibus Persis, mittere rursum in Italiam Belisarium cogitur. Iamq; novies hujus belli annus exibat, Proc. lib. 3. de bell. Goth. pa. 356. redierat autem ex Italia Constantinopolim anno 6. belli Gothici; ut liquet ex Proc. lib. 2. in fine, et lib. 3. in initio.*

x *Imperator Ariobindum ducē in Africam misit, & Artabanum, sed inutilē putans duorum ducum Imperio res administrari, Ariobindo totius Africæ curam delegavit. Proc. de b. ll. Vand. lib. 2. pa. 239.*

y *Convivium Artabanus Gontheridem adcessit, quasi clam ei aliquid dicturus, Gontharidis sancto exilire conanti Artabanus ensem educens latus dextrum capulo tenus confodit, ex quo ille statim moribundus cecidit. Proc. lib. 4. de bello Vandal. pa. 243.*

z *Belisarius Bizantium venit, quum per quinquennium ex Italia nusquam abcessisset. Proc. lib. 3. de bell. Goth. pa. 392. sicque 14. annus hujus belli exibat. Ibid. pa. 394.*

a *Bizantium cum pervenisset, ibi diutius commoratus, ex otio vivere, et in deliciis affluentibus opibus agere, rebus ante hac fœliciter gestis, contentus. Proc. ibid pa. 393.*

b *Bin. not. in vitam Vigilij.* § *De spolys.*

c *Vibs Roma recuperata à Gothis per Belisarium post annum sexagesimum quo eam tenuerunt Gothi, et post Iustiniani annum undetricesimum. Proc. lib. 1. de bell. Goth. pa. 171. et post hac ait, Jamque tertius hujus bello annus exibat. Iib. 2. pa. 313.*

d *Duodecimus annus Iustiniani respondet anno 2. Sylverij. Bar. an. 538. nu. 1. Sylverius autem sedit annos 3. Bar. an. 540. nu. 1. et an. 540. nu. 13.*

e *Bin. not. in vit. Vig. pa. 478.*

f *Bin. not. in vit. Vig. pa. 478.*

now got the harpe of *Orpheus*, hee thought he was alſo able to worke wonders therwith, as well as *Orpheus* had done; he would needs then, *Saxa movere ſono teſtudinis*, but all in vaine: Even ſo *Peters* Chaire made *Vigilius* as infallible as *Peter* himſelfe, being once ſet there hee could doe nothing elſe but drop Oracles, and his fidling on *Orpheus* harpe made an heavenly harmony, but how hee failed in his skill, and proved no better than *Neanthes*, his Conſtitution touching the *Three Chapters* is an eternall record, and yet all that time hee ſat in the Chaire and propheſied, for as the common ſaying is, *Vbi Papa, ibi Roma*; ſo it is as true, *Vbi Papa, ibi Cathedra*, it is more eaſie for the Pope to take the Chaire with him, than, like an Elephant, to carry the whole City of *Rome* upon his backe to *Conſtantinople*, and goe up and downe the world with it.

17. But is this narration, thinke you, of *Anaſtaſius* true? verily not one word therein; neither did the Empreſſe write, nor *Vigilius* anſwer any ſuch thing, for both theſe were done, as *Anaſtaſius* ſaith, *eodem tempore, at, or after that ſame time*, when *Belliſarius*, having killed *Gontharis*, came out of *Africk*, and offered thoſe ſpoiles of the Vandales, and ſeeing, that, as wee have proved, was never; this writing of *Theodora* and anſwer of *Vigilius* was at the ſame tide of Nevermas. Againe, this anſwer of *Vigilius* was given, *ſtatim ac ſanctam ſedem aſcendit, at his very firſt placing in the See*, as *Binius* ſheweth, and that was in the fourteenth [g] yeare of *Iuſtinian*, for then *Sylverius* dyed: now ſeeing *Theodora* writ not this till *Gontharis* was overcome, and that was, as *Procopius* [h] ſheweth, in the nineteenth yeare of *Iuſtinian*; it was a fine deviſe of *Anaſtaſius*, to tell how this new Saint anſwered a letter (by way of propheſie) three or foure yeares before the letter was written. Further, *Vigilius*, as *Liberatus* ſaith [i], *implens promiſſum ſuum, quod Auguſtæ fecerat, performing his promiſe to the Empreſs*, writ a letter in this manner, hee performed it as much as hee could, he laboured a while to doe it, and this was both before and a little after the death of *Sylverius*; but when hee could not effect it, and after that the Emperor had writ unto him to confirme the depoſition of *Anthimus*: *Vigilius* ſeeing his labour to be loſt therein, left off that care untill hee could have a better oportunity to overthrow the Councell of *Chalcedon*, which, ſo long as it ſtood in force, was a barre unto *Anthimus*. If *Vigilius* could have prevailed to have had the fift Councel and the Church approve his *Conſtitution* publiſhed in defence of the *Three Chapters*, by which the Councell of *Chalcedon* had beene quite overthrowne, then in likelihood he would have ſet up *Anthimus*, & all who with *Anthimus* had oppugned the Councell of *Chalcedon*, but till that were done, till the Councell were repealed, *Vigilius* ſaw it was in vaine to ſtrive for *Anthimus*; and therefore waiting for another oportunity for that, hee in two ſeverall Epiſtles, the one to *Iuſtinian*, the other to *Mennas*, confirmed, as the Emperour required him to doe, the depoſition of *Anthimus*; and this hee did the yeare before *Belliſarius* returned to *Conſtantinople* with *Vitiges*, namely in the fourteenth yeare of [k] *Iuſtinian*, and five yeares before the death of *Gontharis*. Would the Empreſſe then write to him to come and doe that which he knew

not

g Bar. an. 54. nu. 2.

h Hoc modo (cæde nimirum Gothariđis et aliorum) Artabanes Carthaginem Juſtiniano reſtituit anno ipſius decimo nono. Procl. lib. 2. de Bell. Vandal. pa. 244.

i Liberat. ca. 22.

k Vt ante probatum eſt hoc cap.

not onely the Emperour moſt conſtantly withſtood, but *Vigilius* alſo, to have five yeares before publikely teſtified to the Emperour, that hee would not doe? ſpecially ſeeing, as *Baronius* [l] ſaith, *Vigilius* by that his letter to the Emperour, *Omnem prorſus, ſive Theodora, ſive alijs ſpem ademiſſet, would put both Theodora, and all elſe out of all hope*, that he ſhould ever performe his promiſe in reſtoring *Anthimus*. So although thoſe words, *eodem tempore*, were not (as they ought to be) referred to the time after the killing of *Gontharis*, but to the time when *Belliſarius* came with *Vitiges* to *Conſtantinople*, which was the yeare [m] after *Vigilius* his letter ſent to the Emperour; yet the *Anaſtaſian* narration is not onely untrue, but wholly improbable, that *Theodora* ſhould then ſend to him to come and reſtore *Anthimus*, who had the yeare before confirmed the depoſing of *Anthimus*, and profeſſed both to the Emperour and *Mennas*, that hee would not reſtore him, and that he ought not to bee reſtored. Laſtly, at this time when *Anaſtaſius* faineth *Theodora* to write to *Vigilius* to come and reſtore *Anthimus*, (which following the death of *Gontharis*, muſt needs bee in the nineteenth or twentieth yeare of *Iuſtinian*) the cauſe of *Anthimus* was quite forgotten and laid aſide, and the *Three Chapters* were then in every mans mouth, and every where debated: The Emperor having in that nineteenth yeare, as by *Victor* [n], who then lived, is evident, if not before, publiſhed his Edict, and called *Vigilius* about that matter to *Conſtantinople*. *Anaſtaſius* dreamed of ſomewhat, and hearing of ſome writing, or ſending to *Vigilius* about that time, he not knowing, or, which I rather thinke, willing to corrupt and falſifie the true narration, for his great love to the Pope, conceales the true and onely cauſe about which the meſſage was ſent to *Vigilius*, and deviſeth a falſe and fained matter about *Anthimus*, and indeavors to draw al men by the noiſe of that from harkning after the cauſe of the *Three Chapters*, which he ſaw would prove no ſmall blemiſh to the Romane See. Iuſt as *Alcibiades* [o] to avoyd a greater infamy, cut off the taile of his beautifull dog, which coſt him 70. *minas Atticas*, (that is of our coyne [p] 218. pound and 15. ſhillings) and filled the mouthes of the people with that trifle, that there might bee no noiſe of his other diſgrace. The true cauſe of ſending to *Vigilius*, as *Victor* ſheweth [q], was about the *Three Chapters*, this of *Anthimus*, which *Anaſtaſius* harpes upon, is in truth no other but the dogs taile, and the din of it hath a long time poſſeſſed the eares of men; but now the true cauſe being come to the open view, fils the world with that ſhamefull hereſie of *Vigilius*, which *Anaſtaſius* would have concealed and covered with his dogs taile. But enough of this paſſage, wherein there are not ſo few as twenty lyes.

18. The next paſſage in *Anaſtaſius* containes the ſending for *Vigilius*, and the manner how hee was taken from *Rome* and brought to *Conſtantinople*: *He tels us that the people of Rome taking that aportunity of the diſpleaſure of Theodora againſt him for his former conſenting to reſtore Anthimus, ſuggeſted divers accuſations againſt him, as that by his Counſell Sylverius was depoſed, and that hee was a murderer, and had killed his Nephew Aſterius, whereupon the Empreſſe ſent Anthimus Scriber to take him*

[l] Bar. an. 540. nu. 22.

[m] *Nam litera Vigily miſſæ Iuſtinianoſunt an. 14. Iuſtiniani.* Bar. an. 540. nu. 14. *Belliſarius autem redit Conſtantinopolim cum Vitige an. Iuſtiniani 15.* Bar. an. 541. nu. 3.

[n] *Iuſtinianus Vigilium compellit ut ad urbē regiam properaret. an. 4. poſt Conſulatum Baſily. Victor. in Chron. in eum an. is autem eſt an. 19. Iuſtiniani ſecundum Bar. an. 545. nu. 1.*

[o] *Plut. in Alcib.*

[p] *Nam mina Attica valet noſtri nummi 3. l. 2. ſ. 6. d. ut teſtatur Edovardus Breirwoodus in lib. ſuo de Pond. ea. 4. quem libri accuratè adverdum hæc tractare, non eſt turdo fili dabiturus.*

[q] *Imperator Vigilium ad regiam urbem compellit venire, ut tria capitula condemnaret. Victor. in Chron. an. 4. poſt Coſſ. Baſily.*

him whereſoever hee were, except onely in the Church of Saint Peter. Scribo came and tooke him in the end of November, and after many indignities both in words and actions, as that the people caſt ſtones, and clubs, and dung after him, wiſhing all evill to goe with him; hee in this violent manner was brought to Sicilie, in December, and on Chriſtmas eve to Conſtantinople, whom the Emperour then meeting, they kiſſed and wept one over the other for joy, and then they led him to the Church of Saint Sophie, the people ſinging an hymne, behold the Lord commeth. Thus Anaſtaſius. Which whole narration to bee a very lying and dunghill legend, were eaſie to demonſtrate, if *Baronius* and *Binius* had not much eaſed us in this part, for they not onely condemne this as untrue, but prove it by divers arguments to be ſuch. The firſt, for that *Vigilius* was called to *Conſtantinople* onely [r] for the cauſe of the *Three Chapters*, and therefore *Anaſtaſius* putting downe other cauſes thereof, *aperti mendacij* [s] *arguitur*, *is convinced of an evident untruth*. The ſecond, becauſe ſeeing, as they ſay, *Mennas* and the chiefe Eaſterne Biſhops would not ſubſcribe to the Edict of the Emperour untill the Pope had conſented, *Iuſtinian* would conciliate [t] the Pope unto him by all faire meanes, and intreate him no otherwiſe but favourably, leaſt if the Pope were diſpleaſed, he ſhould not yeeld his conſent, and then the whole purpoſe of the Emperour ſhould bee made fruſtrate. Their third reaſon is an argument *à teſtimonio negativè*, becauſe neither [u] *Procopius* nor *Facundus* mention any ſuch violence or abuſe offered to the Pope, of which reaſon I have ſpoken before. A fourth is taken from the time; whereas he ſaith, that *Vigilius* came to *Conſtant.* on Chriſtmas eve, *mendacij* [x] *redarguitur*, hee is proved to lye, by that which *Procopius* ſaith. Many other reaſons might bee added, but theſe of *Baronius* and *Binius* are ſufficient to convince *Anaſtaſius* of lying, and open lying in this paſſage, which is, as now you ſee, nothing but a fardell of lyes; for neither did the people take that oportunity to accuſe *Vigilius*, nor did they accuſe him of thoſe crimes, nor did the Empreſſe for that cauſe ſend for *Vigilius*, neither did ſhee, but *Iuſtinian* call him to *Conſtantinople*, neither did ſhee ſend *Anthimus Scribo* to pull him away by violence, neither commanded ſhe him not to forbeare *Vigilius* in any place, but only in Saint *Peters* Church (this was but the kind affection of *Anaſtaſius* to the honour of *Peters* See) neither did ſhee ſweare to excommunicate *Scribo* if hee brought not *Vigilius*, neither did *Scribo* apprehend him in the Temple of Saint *Cicile*, neither did *Vigilius* diſtribute a largeſſe at that time when he was apprehended, neither did they violently carry him to *Tiber* and there ſhip him, neither did the people follow him, and deſire him to pray for them; neither when the ſhip was gone, did they revile him, nor caſt ſtones, nor clubs, nor dung after him, nor imprecate and curſe him, neither was hee at that time brought, but as by *Procopius* [y] appeareth, long before hee voluntarily went to *Sicilie*, and made ſo long ſtay there, that the Emperour having called him the yeare before, as by *Victor* [z] is cleare, by reaſon of his long abode in *Sicilie*, he called him the yeare after againe out of *Sicily*, as *Procopius* ſheweth. Neither came he to Conſtantinople on Chriſtmas Eeve, but either on the five and twentieth of Ianuary, as

Mar-

[r] Trium Capitulorum cauſâ tantum vocatus eſt. Bin. not. in vita Vigily.
[s] Tunc Romani. Non alia cauſa profectionis Vigilij Conſtantinopolim cognoſcitur. Bar. an. 546. nu. 55.
[t] Bar. an. eodem 546. nu. 54.
[u] Putavit Vigilium, quibus poſſet fieri, blandiis conciliandum. Bin. loc. cit. Eum ſibi quibus valuit, ſtuduit conciliare blandiiys. Bar. an. 546. nu. 55.
[x] Bar. an eo. n. 54
[y] Bar. an eod. 546. nu. 60.
[z] Interea Vigilius ab Imperatore ex Siciliâ evocatus, Byzantium venit. Nam ut eò contenderent, diutiùm in eâ inſulâ traxerunt morâ. Proc. lib. 3. de bell. Goth. p. 364
Evocatus autem fuit circa finem an. 11. bell. Goth. ut liquet, expreſſè dictis verbis; undecimus hujus belliſe verterat annus. Interea Vigilius, &c.
Iam 11. illius belli eſt Iuſtiniani 20. nam belli capit anno ejus nono prope finito, ut teſtatur. Proc. lib. 1. Bell. Goth. pa. 253.
Imperator ſe ad bellum parat, annos novenas potitus Imperio.
[z] Victor loc. cit. etiam et Marcellinus anno priori evocatum ab Imperatore, ſed ſequenti Conſtan. veniſſe expreſſè docet. In Chron. an. 546. et 547.

Marcellinus [a] saith, or as by *Procopius*, who is farre more worthy of credit, may bee gathered [b], about the middle of *April* next ensuing, neither did the Emperour when they met, kisse him, nor did they weepe for joy, the one of the other, nor did they sing the hymne of *Ecce advenit Dominus Dominator, behold the Lord the Ruler is come.* It was a very pretty allusion of *Anastasius*, and very apt for the season, in honour of the Pope to take part of the text expressing the joy for Christs Advent in the flesh, and turne it to an *Anthem* to congratulate the Popes Advent on Christmas eve to *Constantinople*; but I feare it will hardly be beleeved, that men in those dayes did use such base, nay, blasphemous flattery to the Pope; this hymne would have better befitted the time of *Leo* the tenth, when in the open Councell they durst say [c], to Pope *Leo*, Weepe not O daughter Syon, *Ecce venit Leo de Tribu Iuda, behold the Lion of the Tribe of Iuda commeth*, the roote of *Iesse*; behold GOD hath raised up to thee a Saviour, who shall save thee from the hands of the destroying Turks, and deliver thee from the hand of the Persecutors; O most blessed *Leo*, wee have looked for thee, we have hoped that thou shouldest come and be our deliverer. The former *Anthem* had beene sutable to such a time; the art of their blasphemous *Gnatonisme* to the Popes, was not halfe learned in *Iustinians* dayes, and most incredible it is, that *Iustinian* would use, or could endure in his presence, such entertainment of *Vigilius*, knowing that hee was an earnest and violent oppugner of his Imperiall Edict, in which he had expressly anathematized and accursed all that did defend the *Three Chapters*. This proclaming of an *Anathema* against *Vigilius*, and the hymne of *Ecce advenit Dominus Dominator*, with kissing & weeping for joy, make no good concord nor harmony together. Let this be accounted for no moe than twenty Anastasian lyes, and those are the fewest which are bound up in this fardle.

19. After that *Anastasius* hath, as you have seene, safely landed the Pope at *Constantinople*, then hee tels you, *That for two yeares space there was continuall strife about Anthimus, the Emperour and Empresse laboured to have Vigilius restore him, urged him with his promise and handwriting, but Vigilius would no way consent; and when he found them so heavy towards him, he said, I perceive now it was not Iustinian and Theodora, but Diocletian and Eleutherius that called mee hither, doe with me what you will: thereupon they buffeted him, and called him homicide, and killer of Sylverius; then hee fled to the Church of Euphemia, and held himselfe by a Piller of the Altar, but they pulld him thence, cast him out of the Church, put a rope about his necke, dragged him through all the City till evening, and then put him in prison, feeding him with a little bread and water, and after this they banished him also with the rest of the Romane Clergy.* And these, like the rest, are meerely the fond and sottish dreames of *Anastasius*, or, as *Baronius* useth to call them, lyes. *Baronius* will assure you, that it was not *Anthimus* or his restoring, but the *Three Chapters* about which *Vigilius* was sent for. The cause of *Anthimus*, who was deposed tenne [d] yeares before, was quite forgotten: and to see the sottishnesse of *Anastasius*, *Iustinian* had long before [e] written to *Vigilius*, requiring him to confirme the deposition of *Anthimus*, *Vigilius* [f] had done this upon the Emperours

a *Vigilius Constantinopolim ingressus est 8. Calend. Febr.*

b *Nam adventus Vigilij Constantinopolim ponitur à Procopio, in initio 12. anni belli Gothici, lib. 3. pa. 364. jam 12. an. illius belli incboatur in fine anni 20. Iustiniani; is autem imperare cœpit 1. die Aprilis, ut docet Marcell. in Chr. an. 527.*

c *Conc. Later. sub Leone 10. sess. 6. in Orat. Simonis Begnij.*

d *Anthimus deposítus in Conc. Constant. sub Menna, Act. 4. an post. Cons. Basilij, qui est primus belli Gothici, Vigilius autem venit Byzantium an. 12. ejusdem belli.*

e *Anno. circiter 540. Bar. in illum an. tit. 12.*

f *Bar. an. eod. num. 18.*

Emperours letter, the Popes letters are recorded both in *Baronius* and *Binius*, dated when *Iuſtinus* was Conſull, which was ſixe whole yeares before the Popes comming to *Conſtantinople*, all that time the Emperour ſtill liked the depoſing of *Anthimus*, and many wayes had approved *Mennas* for the Biſhop. Now after all this, when the whole Church, and every man was troubled with a more waighty cauſe of the *Three Chapters*, *Anaſtaſius* brings in this, that the Emperour, and the Pope quarrelled for two yeares, about an old forgotten matter of *Anthimus*, wherein there was a perfect concord betwixt them both: nay, that is nothing to quarrell, but that the Emperour, like *Diocleſian* ſhould cauſe him to be beaten, to bee reviled, to be puld from the Altar and Sanctuary, and haled about the towne by a rope about his necke, impriſon and baniſh him, and all for his refuſing to doe that which the Emperour had decreed to be done, and commanded him to do the ſame, that for this cauſe their kiſſes ſhould be turned into curſes, and they both now weep a contrary weeping to their former, the Emperour wept becauſe *Vigilius* would not doe that which the Emperour himſelfe commanded him not to doe; the Pope wept for that he was trailed in a rope about the towne, and all for not doing that which the Emperour would not have him to doe: Truely this ſurpaſſeth the degree of a fable or untruth. *Voraginenſis* himſelfe could not deviſe a more ſimple and ſottiſh Legend.

20. If this doe not ſufficiently perſwade you of the untruth of this paſſage, ſee how *Baronius* and *Binius* doe contradict the ſame, for in this ſhort narration are contained thoſe *complura mendacia*, as *Baronius* cals [f] them, which writers, and firſt of all *Anaſtaſius*, delivereth. The Church of *Euphemia*, whither the Pope fled, was, as *Anaſtaſius* ſaith, one of the Churches in *Conſtantinople*: *Baronius* [g] and *Binius* [h] tels you, it was the Church in *Chalcedon*; *Anaſtaſius* ſaith, the Pope was puld thence from the Altar. *Baronius* [i] tels you the Emperour ſent a moſt honorable meſſage to intreat him to come from thence, but the Pope refuſed, till the Emperour yeelded to his demands in recalling his Edict. Laſtly, *Baronius* [k] and *Binius* [l] will aſſure you, that the buffeting of *Vigilius*, his fleeing to the Church of *Euphemia*, and their haling him from thence did all happen divers yeares, three at leaſt after the death of *Theodora* the Empreſſe; but *Anaſtaſius* referres all that to the time of *Theodora*, and makes her another *Eleutheria*, as great an agent in all this as *Diocleſian* himſelfe: belike as *Eleutheria* by a *metempſeuchoſis*, was changed into *Theodora*, ſo *Theodora* by a like Necromanticall tricke of *Anaſtaſius* was raiſed out of her grave to buffet, to beate, and baniſh Pope *Vigilius* for not reſtoring *Anthimus*.

21. That which, as it ſeemes, gave occaſion of this whole errour to *Anaſtaſius*, was a matter done by *Agapetus*: Hee when hee came to *Conſtantinople*, had much contention with the *Acephali*, who were oppugners of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, among which *Anthimus* the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* was one, and a moſt earneſt defender of that ſect. It is not unlike but *Iuſtinian* at the firſt favoured *Anthimus*, untill he perceived him to be hereticall. *Anaſtaſius* [m] further ſaith, *that Iuſtinian favoured not onely the perſon, but the very hereſie of Anthimus*, and re-

lates

f Bar. an. 552. nu. 16.

g In Baſilica S. Euphemiæ, quæ eſt Chalcedone habitare diſpoſuit Vigilius. Bar. an. 552. nu. 8.

h Confugit Chalcedonem in Baſilicam S. Euphemiæ. Bin. Not. in vitam Vigilij § Tunc dedit.

i Imperator dignam tanto Pontificè legationè ornavit, &c. At Vigilius egredi nunquam conſentit, niſi prius &c. Bar. an. 552 nu. 11, 12.

k Hoc tempore (vid. an. 552.) accidiſſe noſcitur quæ Anaſtaſius confundit cum prioribus quæ acciderunt, vivente Theodora. Bar. an. 552. nu. 8

Theodora autem obijt an. 548. ut ait Bar. illo anno nu. 24.

l Hæc quæ ſequuntur contigerunt poſt obitum Theodoræ. Bin. not. in vitam Vigilij § Tunc dedit.

m Agapetus altercationem capit habere cum Imperatore de religione, &c. Anaſt. in vita Agapeti.

lates certaine threatning words uſed by *Iuſtinian* againſt *Agapetus* for that cauſe, as if *Iuſtinian* had ſayd, either conſent to us, or I will baniſh thee; which the Pope anſwered in the ſame manner almoſt as *Vigilius* is ſayd to have done, I thought I had come to *Iuſtinian*, but now I perceive I have found *Diocleſian*: upon which narration of *Anaſtaſius*, *Baronius* [n] and *Binius*, (having an implacable hatred to *Iuſtinian*,) ſay, that he was ſuſpected of hereſie, and to cleare himſelfe, he upon the Popes command [o], publiſhed againe his profeſſion of the true faith. But that neither *Anaſtaſius* nor *Baronius* are herein to bee credited, may cleerly appeare, partly becauſe *Iuſtinian* had before publiſhed an orthodoxall profeſſion in the beginning [p] of the Popedome of *Agapetus*, and ſpecially by that ample teſtimony, which is given him by the Eaſterne and orthodoxall Biſhops in the Councell under *Mennas*, after the death of *Agapetus*, who [q] ſay of him, that *à primordiis regni ſui uſque nunc, from the very beginning of his Empire till then*, he ſtudied to keepe the whole body of the Church ſound, and intire, and free from all infection of hereſies. So farre was he from ſupporting that hereſie, or *Anthimus* in it, when he once knew him to defend the ſame. *Theodora* the Empreſſe, by whoſe meanes *Anthimus* (who ſecretly oppugned the Councell of *Chalcedon*) was tranſlated from *Trapezuntum* to *Conſtantinople*; ſhe I ſay was indeed for a time more earneſt for *Anthimus*, both to prevent his depoſition, and after it was paſt, to have him reſtored by the meanes of *Vigilius*. *Liberatus* who then lived, ſaying nothing of the Emperours threats (which had *Iuſtinian* uſed, for the ill will *Liberatus* bare to *Iuſtinian*, he would not have omitted) expreſly mentioneth [r] both how *Theodora* by rewards ſought to corrupt *Agapetus*, and when that prevailed not, added threats thereunto; and how the Pope would not at all conſent to her motion. *Victor* [s], who alſo lived at that time, ſaith that *Agapetus communione privavit, did excommunicate Theodora*, the patron of *Anthimus*, an oppugner of the Councell of *Chalcedon*: whence it may appeare, that *Anaſtaſius* aſcribes to the Emperour that which was done by the Empreſſe, againſt *Agapetus*, and if any ſuch words were uſed by *Agapetus*, as comparing their tyranny to *Diocleſians* perſecution, it was ſpoken no way of *Iuſtinian*, (who was even then a moſt earneſt defender of the true faith,) but of *Theodora*: who for a while laboured for *Anthimus*, and againſt the Councell of *Chalcedon*, till ſeeing that ſhee could not prevaile therein, neither by the meanes of *Agapetus*, nor *Silverius*, nor *Vigilius*, after he had once writ to the Emperour, his confirmation of the depoſition of *Anthimus*, ſhe then changed her mind, the cauſe of the *three Chapters* being then moved, ſhe became as the Emperour himſelfe was, an earneſt condemner of the *three Chapters*, as by [t] *Victor* is evident, that is in truth an earneſt defender of the Councell of *Chalcedon*. Now upon this truth (errour alwayes having ſome truth for his ground) *Anaſtaſius* [u] buildeth many fabulous and poeticall fictions of his owne deviſing: as that *Iuſtinian* and *Agapetus* quarrelled about the faith, *Agapetus* defending againſt him the two natures in Chriſt; that the Emperour threatned baniſhment to *Agapetus*, unleſſe he would conſent with him, and deny the two natures; that *Agapetus*

n *Imperator ipſe in ſuſpitionem hæreſis eſt adductus.* Bar. an. 536. nu. 18. *et idem ait Binius Not. in vitam Agapeti.* §. *Hic miſſus. Et, apud eum voluit juſſio pontificia.* Bar. an. cit. nu. 19.

o *Non obtemperare Romano Pontifici, neſas ratus, editam confeſſionem iterat.* Bar. an. 536. nu. 18.

p *Simulat Agapetus eſt creatus Papa, Iuſtinianus rectæ fidei profeſſionem Romam miſit.* Bar. an. eod. nu. 18.

q *Act.* 1. *pa.* 429. *a.*

r *Liber. ca.* 21. *Auguſta clam promittente munera, et rurſus Papæ (Agapeto) minas intentante.*

s *Vict. Tun. in Chron. ſub Coſſ. Iuſtin.*

t *Nam Victor aſſerit Theodoram laborâſſe ut tria Capitula condemnentur. in ſuo Chron. ſub an.* 2. *poſt Conſ. Baſilij.*

u *In vita Agapeti.*

gapetus called him *Diocleſian*; that *Agapetus* diſputed with *Anthimus*, and overcame him before the Emperour; that the Emperour thereupon humbled himſelfe to the Pope, and adored [x] the moſt bleſſed *Agapetus*; that then hee baniſhed *Anthimus*, and entreated *Agapetus* to conſecrate *Mennas* in his roome. Now *Anaſtaſius* perceiving theſe his fictions concerning *Iuſtinian* and *Agapetus*; wherein hee had ſome ground of truth, to be plauſible, and his end being this, *Papæ ut placerēt, quas feciſſet fabulas*, hee brings in *Iuſtinian* and *Vigilius* to act the very ſame pageant againe; and that without any ground of truth, they for ſooth, tenne yeares after *Anthimus* was depoſed; and for ought appeareth was dead at that time, muſt come in quarrelling againe about *Anthimus*, as freſh as ever the Emperour and *Agapetus* had done before: nay they muſt contend two other whole yeares after the former tenne: about this *Helena*, *Iuſtinian* and his Empreſſe muſt for want of variety of phraſes be termed *Diocleſian* and *Eleutheria*, *Vigilius* muſt be buffeted and beaten, haled, dragged, impriſoned, and baniſhed. Truly *Anaſtaſius* had ſome ground for the act under *Agapetus*, for this of *Vigilius* he is beholding to none but his own poeticall pate; & leſt any little ſcene or ſhadow of reſemblance might be wanting, *Baronius* [y] ſupplying one defect in *Anaſtaſius*, tels us how *Vigilius* for the ſame cauſe of *Anthimus*, excommunicated *Theodora* at his comming to *Conſtantinople*, even as *Agapetus* had done before. Who ſees not all this to be nothing elſe but a *mimeſis* of the acts of *Agapetus*, and a meere fiction of *Anaſtaſius?* in which there are not ſo few as thirty lyes.

22. You have ſeene the tragicall part of this Anaſtaſian fable, now followeth the *Cataſtrophe* or ſudden change of all this hard fortune: *Tunc Gothi fecerunt, then* (ſaith he) *the Gothes made Totilas their King, who comming to Rome beſieged it ſo ſore, that the City was preſſed with a great famine, ſo that they did eate their owne children. Totilas entred the Citie at the gate of Saint Paul, in the 13. Indiction, and for a whole night cauſed a Trumpet to be ſounded, till all the Romane people were fled away, or hid in Churches. And Totilas dwelled with the Romanes, quaſi pater cum filijs, even as a father with his children.* Thus *Anaſtaſius*. Who would not think by this narration that *Totilas* were made King after the beating, dragging, and impriſonment of *Vigilius*, and baniſhment of him & his fellows, upō which *Anaſtaſius* preſently adjoyneth, *Tunc Gothi fecerunt, then the Gothes made Totilas King*; and yet *Totilas* was King [a] not onely before all that tragicall act, but foure or five yeares alſo before *Vigilius* came to *Conſtantinople*, or before the Emperour ſent for him, and in like ſort *Totilas* his beſieging of *Rome* by *Anaſtaſius* narration follows all the former: whereas by *Procopius* [b] it is evident that *Totilas* beſieged *Rome* while *Vigilius* ſtayed in *Sicilie*, before he ſet forward to *Conſtantinople*. The like errour is in the note of the Indiction; for *Totilas* tooke the City, not as *Anaſtaſius* ſaith in the 13. but as [c] *Marcellinus* witneſſeth, and that aright, in the 10. Indiction: neither did he enter at the gate of Saint *Paul*, but as *Procopius* [d] expreſly declareth, at that which was called *Aſinaria*: neither did *Totilas* ſound any ſuch Trumpet, to give them warning or ſpace to flee, but entring the City in the night, and that by trechery of the watch, he ſtayed [e] his army together

x *Auguſtus adoravit beatiſſimū Agapetum Papam. Anaſt. ibid.*

y *Bar. an. 547. nu. 49.*

a *Totilas creatus Rex Gothorum anno 7. belli Gothici. Proc. lib. 3. pa. 346. Is eſt annus Iuſt. 16. ut ait Bar. an. 542. nu. 1. Vigilius Byzantium venit anno 12. belli Gothici. Proc. lib. 3. pa. 364. is eſt Iuſtiniani 21. & iſto anno Conſtantinopolim veniſſe Vigilium, ait Bar. an. 547. nu. 26.*

b *Totilas Romam contendit quam ſtatim obſedit. Procop. lib. 3. pa. 360. Per id tempus (obſidionis) cum Vigilius in Sicilia eſſet, &c. lib. eod. pa. 364.*

c *Indictione 10. & 6. poſt Conſ. Baſilij anno, Totilas Romam ingreditur. Marc. in chron. Is eſt juxta eundem Marc. an. 547. cui conſentit Bar. an. 547. nu. 12.*

d *Univerſo exercitu inſtructo ad portam Aſinariam duxit, &c. Proc. lib. 3. p. 372.*

e *Unum in locum copias omnes coegit hoſtium inſidias veritus. Proc. ibid.*

ther till morning, for feare that ſome danger might befall himſelfe or his army in the darke, by the lying in wait of the enemies. And when after this, *Belliſarius* having recovered the City, *Totilas* againe wan it from the Romanes, which was three yeares after this, to wit, in the 15. yeare of the Gothicke warre, as *Procopius* [f] ſheweth, which was the 24. of *Iuſtinian*, whereas his firſt taking it was in the 21. of *Iuſtinian*; then indeed *Totilas*, as *Procopius* [g] declareth, cauſed divers Trumpets to ſound an alarum on the river of Tyber in the night time, as if hee would on that ſide aſſault the City, while hee had his army in readineſſe on the contrary ſide, and entred there by trechery alſo of the Watch; the Romanes giving little regard to that part. Theſe Trumpets gave the occaſion to *Anaſtaſius* his fiction, which is ſo blockiſh, that what *Totilas* uſed as a warlike ſtratagem to deceive, and more eaſily to overthrow and kill the Romanes, that *Anaſtaſius* in his ſimplicity takes and relates as done in favour of the Romanes, that they might eſcape and not be killed. And yet the taking of the City, wherof *Anaſtaſius* ſpeaketh, cannot be this ſecond, wherein the Trumpets were ſounded, but the former, (at which time *Totilas* uſed no ſuch policie) as appeares by the famine which *Anaſtaſius* [h] mentioneth, which happened in this former [i], and not at this ſecond taking of *Rome* by *Totilas*. So very incoherent and falſe is all that *Anaſtaſius* writeth of this matter. But whereas *Anaſtaſius* addes of King *Totilas* that hee dwelt among the Romanes as a father among his children, I know not how to checke ſo great a folly. The barbarous Gothes, after that long and miſerable ſiege of the Romanes, having by trechery in the night entred the City, the very next [k] morning when they ſaw there was no danger of the enemy, *Quos obvios habent, obtruncant; killed all that they met*; and had made no end of ſlaughter, if *Pelagius* [l] comming in moſt ſubmiſſive manner had not ſtayed their Gothiſh fury. The Romane people [m], ſo many as could by flight, ſought their ſafety: there remained of their innumerable Romane troups, but to the number of five hundred, the Noblemen [n] and better ſort who remained among them, led a life more ignominious and miſerable than death, being ſpoyled of all, *domos circumeundo, foreſq; appulſando cibum dari ſibi ſupplicitèr precabantur; from doore to doore in moſt abject and beggerly manner praying for ſome reliefe of the proud and inſolent victor*: nor was *Totilas* content herewith, but he was reſolved [o] to ruinate and utterly deface the whole city of *Rome*, which alſo he had then done, had not the moſt prudent perſwaſions [p] of *Belliſarius* never ſufficiently even for this onely cauſe to bee commended, hindred ſo barbarous a deſigne. And which is noted as one of the moſt miſerable ſpectacles of all other, in Rome which was the moſt frequent, populous, and eminent City in the whole world, *Totilas* when he went away left not ſo much as one man [q], woman, or childe to remaine or inhabit therein; would any but *Anaſtaſius* call or account this fatherly uſage? what is then, or can

f *Annus 14. exibat hujus belli, Totilas deinde copias Romam duxit, &c.* Proc. l. 3. pa. 394.

g *Præcepit ut quanta vi poſſet buccinâ clangorem ederent, &c.* Proc. ibid. pa. 394.

h *Et fuit fama eſt ſames in civitate talis, &c.* Anaſt. in vita Vigily.

i *Vt teſtatur.* Proc. l. 3. p. 367.

k *Ubi primum illuxit Gothi, &c.* Proc. pa. 373.

l *Pelagius Totilæ ſupplex factus, non prius precari hunc deſiit, quam ille clementiorem ſore in Romanos pollicitus eſſet.* Proc. lib. 3. pa. 374.

m *Pars maxima fugam capeſſunt, pauci in templo perfugium habuere, conſtat è plebe ad quingentos in urbe reſides.* Proc. ibid. pa. 372.

n *Inter hos erat Ruſticiana filia Symmachi, et uxor Boethij Senatoris.* Proc. ib.

o *Totilas Romã ad ſolum proſternere decrevit.* Proc. pa. 375.

p *E ducibus (ſic ad eum ſcripſit Belliſarius) alterum neceſſe eſt ut aut bello victus ſuccumbas, aut ut nos vincas. Si victus, et Romam demoliaris, non alterius urbem ſed tuam delebis, quâ ſervatâ, longe opulentior fies. Si victus ſis, Româ incolumi reſervata, gratia tibi nec mediocris apud victorem conciliabitur, qua deleta nullus tibi ad clementiam locus relinquetur. His (inter ſimiles alias) perſuaſionibus uſus eſt Belliſarius apud Totilam, ut refert* Proc. lib 3. pa. 375.

q *Null: hominum in urbe relicto, quam penitus deſtitutam demiſerat.* Proc. lib. eod. p. 376. *Roma fuit ita deſolata ut nemo ibi hominum, niſi beſtiæ morarentur.* Marcell. in Chronan. 547.

be called hoſtile, ſavage, and barbarous? But let us leave this paſſage, wherein we will account no more than ten of *Anaſtaſius* grand lyes, and proceed to the reſt of his narration.

23. *At the ſame time*, ſaith he, *the Emperour ſent Narſes into Italie; to whom God gave the victory over the Gothes, the King and a great multitude of them were ſlaine*. I ſhould have thought this *eodem tempore* to have had relation (as in an orderly narration it ought) to that taking of *Rome* by *Totilas*, which is before expreſſed; which if *Anaſtaſius* meant, then is this circumſtance moſt ſutable to all the reſt, that is, wholly untrue: for *Totilas* the firſt time tooke Rome in the 12. and the ſecond time in the 15. yeare of the Gothicke warre, whereas *Narſes* overcame him not, nor came as chiefe Generall into *Italy* till the eighteenth yeare of the ſame warre. All which by *Procopius*[r] is clearly teſtified. But *Binius* doth here ſet to his helping hand, and making a gloſſe upon the text, by two notes of time he declareth unto what this Anaſtaſian *eodem tempore* is to be referred: the former is this: It was, ſaith he[s], *Illo anno quo Imperator revocavit Edictum; in that yeare wherein the Emperour at the inſtance of Pope Vigilius recalled the Edict, which he had publiſhed concerning the three Chapters, ſhewing himſelfe therein obedient to the Pope; in that yeare Narſes the Captaine of the Romane armie, truſting to the helpe of God, by the interceſſion of the bleſſed Virgin Mary, put to flight and killed Totilas, with his whole army*. So *Binius*: upon whoſe gloſſe it will inevitably follow that *Narſes* never overcame *Totilas*, nor was ſent Generall into Italie. For it is certaine, (as before wee have by many reaſons proved) and by the teſtimony of the whole generall Councell[t], that *Iuſtinian* did not at all recall that Edict: he was both before and after the Councell, yea after the death of *Vigilius*, earneſt in the defence thereof. But let us admit that hee had indeed recalled that Edict; when thinke you was this done? No man can tell you better than *Baronius*, who referres all that to the 26. yeare of *Iuſtinian*, which is the 17. of the Gothicke warre; for by his narration[u], not onely the Emperour in that yeare revoked his *Edict* againſt the *Three Chapters*, but he with *Theodorus* Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, and *Mennas*, were all in that yeare reconciled to the Pope, and a perfect peace concluded on all hands before the moneth of Iuly; peace being concluded *Mennas* ſhortly after dyed. If then as *Binius* gloſſeth, *Totilas* was ſlaine *eo anno*, in that yeare wherein *Iuſtinian* is ſuppoſed to have recalled his Edict, then was he certainly vanquiſhed and ſlaine, not by *Narſes*, for he as *Procopius*[x] ſheweth, came not as chiefe Generall into *Italy*, untill the 18. yeare of the Gothicke warre, which is the 27. of *Iuſtinian*. Againe, ſeeing it followeth in *Anaſtaſius*, *Tunc adunatus*, then when *Totilas* was vanquiſhed and killed, did the Romane Clergie entreat to have *Vigilius* with the reſt reſtored from exile. It hence clearly followeth, that *Anaſtaſius* can meane no other exile, than ſuch as was inflicted upon him ſome three or foure yeares before, for the cauſe of *Anthimus*, and not that which followed the Councell: for the Councell was not held in the ſeventeenth yeare of the Gothicke warre, or ſix and twentieth of *Iuſtinian*, but in the eighteenth of the one, and ſeven and twentieth of the other, as the Acts doe witneſſe:

or

r De Roma capta, ſupra oſtendimus. De Narſete liquet, ex Proc. lib. 3. pa. 408. ubi ait Iam 17. huius belli exibat annus. Et paulo poſt, Narſes ex Salonis (in Sicilia) profectus adverſus Totilam progreditur. Ibid.

s Bin. Not. in vitam Vigilij. §. Eodem.

t Iuſtinianus omnia ſemper fecit, & facit, quæ ſanctam Eccleſiam & recta dogmata conſervant. Conc. 5. Coll. 7. in fine.

u Bar. an. 55. nu. 15. 22. 23.

x Proc. lib. 3. pa. 408.

or if *Baronius* will needs have the exile following the Councell, to be that from which *Narſes* entreated that he might be delivered; then it certainly followeth upon this account of *Binius*, reckoning *Totilas* death to be in the ſix and twentieth of *Iuſtinian*, that *Narſes* and the Romane Clergy entreated the Emperour to reſtore *Vigilius* out of exile, before he was caſt into exile; nay before the Councell was aſſembled, or before *Vigilius* had given any cauſe why he ſhould be baniſhed; which doth not well accord with the wiſedome of *Narſes* and the Romane Clergy to entreat, nor was it poſſible for the Emperour to grant. The ſame is further manifeſt by the other note of time which *Binius** ſets down, that *Totilas* was killed *decimo anno regni ſui*, in the 10 year of his reigne, as the holy Monk *Bennet* had foretold unto him: for *Totilas* was made King of the Goths in the 7. yeare of the Gothick war, as *Procopius* [y] teſtifieth; which was in the 16. yeare of *Iuſtinian*, and as it ſeemeth by his Acts, in the beginning of the yeare. But to helpe the Benedictine propheſie, we will ſuppoſe him to be made in the laſt end of all, and account the next yeare for his firſt: yet even ſo muſt *Totilas* be vanquiſhed and ſlaine before the beginning of the 18. yeare of the Gothicke war, or 27. of *Iuſtinian*, for with the end of the 17. yeare of the Gothicke warre is fully completed the tenth yeare of *Totilas*. Wherefore if *Benedict* was not a lying Prophet, and if *Totilas* was ſlaine *decimo anno, in his tenth yeare*, then all the former inconveniences doe upon this account alſo enſue, that he was not vanquiſhed by *Narſes*; that then, when he was ſlain, *Narſes* & the Romane Clergy did not entreat for the delivery of *Vigilius* out of baniſhment, and the like; ſeeing it is certaine that *Narſes* came not into *Italie*, and that *Vigilius* was not baniſhed (by that Baronian exile which followeth the Councell) till the 18. yeare of the Gothicke war, and 27. of *Iuſtinian*. Or if any to excuſe *Binius* will expound as *Baronius* [z] doth, the propheſie to be meant that *Totilas* was ſlaine *anno decimo*, that is, in the tenth yeare being complete, that plainly contradicteth the propheſie: for if the tenth yeare was wholly ended, then was he not ſlaine in the tenth, but onely in the eleventh yeare, nor in the tenth otherwiſe than in the firſt, ſecond, or ſixt yeare; nay ſlaine in the yeare before hee was borne, that is, ſlaine after all thoſe yeares ended and fully completed.

* *Bin not. cit.*

y *Hujus belli annus ſextus exierat. Proc. lib. 3 pa. 346. & Totilas ex conventu ſuſcepit imperium. idem pa. 347.*

z *Necatur Totilas, anno undecimo regni ſui inchoato, decimo expleto. Bar. an. 553. nu. 16.*

24. Now that which *Binius* [a] interlaceth of the Emperours being ſo obſequent and obedient to the Pope; or as *Baronius* [b] expreſſeth it, for being ruled by the Popes command, theſe as being but flouriſhes of their vanity and arrogancy, I will paſſe over. The Acts both of *Iuſtinian*, and of the fift Councell doe demonſtrate that *Iuſtinian* was (as he ought to be) the commander of the Pope, the Popes Empire was not as yet in the cradle. But that which is added, that *Narſes* overcame the Gothes by the interceſſion of the bleſſed Virgin, I am deſirous a little more at large to examine, the rather, becauſe [c] *Baronius* little leſſe than triumpheth therein. *Narſes*, ſaith he, *indevored all theſe things, Mariæ virginis ope, by the help of the virgin Mary*. And again, having cited certain words out of *Evagrius* to prove it, By this, ſaith [d] he, you do underſtand, *cujus niti præſidio duces debeant, on whoſe help Generals & Captains muſt rely*, that they may perform every difficulteſt enterpriſe,

a *Se Rom. Pontifici obſequentem præbet. Bin. loc. citat. et itidem Bar. an. 553. nu. 16.*

b *Dum ſibi imperari à Rom. Pontifice paſſus eſt. Bar. ibid. nu. 17.*

c *Bar. an. 553. nu. 15.*

d *Ibid. nu. 18.*

truely even on the helpe of *Mary* the Mother of God, who being invocated by our prayers may riſe againſt the enemy, for of her the Church ſingeth, *Terribilis ut Caſtrorum acies, thou art terrible as an army well ordered.* Thus the Cardinall, wreſting and abuſing the Scripture, to draw mens confidence from the Lord of Hoſts to the bleſſed Virgin, making her, contrary to her ſexe, to be another *Mars*, and a chiefe warrier in all the greateſt battels of the Chriſtians. But for the truth of the matter, what *Narſes* did, *Procopius* doth declare, who thus writeth [e] of him; When *Totilas* was overcome, *Narſes* being exceeding joyfull, *id omne Deo acceptũ ut erat in vero indeſinenter referre, did continually attribute all that victorie to God, to whom in truth it was to be aſcribed.* *Evagrius* the Cardinals own witneſſe, teſtifieth the ſame, even in that place which the Cardinall alledgeth, his words are theſe [f], φασὶ τοίνυν, they who were with *Narſes* report, that, *dum precibus divinum numen placeret, while he appeaſed or pleaſed God by his prayer, & other offices of piety, and gave due honour unto him, the Virgin, Mother of God appeared unto him, and plainly ſet downe the time when he ſhould fight with the enemies, nor fight wᵗʰ thẽ til he received a ſign from above.* Thus *Evag.* in whoſe words three things are to be obſerved: Firſt, that *Narſes* uſed noin vocatiõ or prayersto the bleſſed Virgin, or any other, but only to God, it was *Divinũ numen, the very Godhead*, which hee did in his prayers, & offices of piety adore. Secondly, that *Evag.* mentioneth not either invocation, or adoration, uſed by *Narſes* to the Virgin, or any confidence that hee repoſed in her, or that ſhe at al helped him in the battle, but only that ſhe appeared unto him as a meſſenger, to ſignifie what time he ſhould fight. Now as the Angel *Gabriel* was no helper to the Virgin *Mary*, either in the cõception of Chriſt, or in his birth, though, as a meſſenger from God, hee ſignifieth them both unto *Ioſeph*, (*Ioſeph* neither invocating him nor relying on him, but on God, whoſe meſſenger he was) even ſo, admitting the truth of this apparition, the Vigin *Mary* did ſignifie from God the time when *Narſes* ſhould fight, but neither did *Narſes* invocate or adore her, nor did ſhee her ſelfe more helpe in the battle than the Angell in the birth of Chriſt; nor did the confidence of *Narſes* relie on her, but on God, whoſe meſſenger he then beleeved her to be. Let the Cardinall, or *Binius*, or any of them prove forcibly (which they can never doe) out of *Evagrius* any other invocation or adoration uſed by *Narſes* to the bleſſed Virgin, and I will conſent unto them in that whole point. Thirdly, all that *Evagrius* ſaith of that apparition of the bleſſed Virgin, is but a rumour and report of ſome who were with *Narſes*: φασὶ τίνων, ſome ſay, *Evagrius* himſelfe doth not ſay it was ſo, or that *Narſes* either ſaid or beleeved it to be ſo, but reported it was by ſome of the ſouldiers of *Narſes*, whether true or falſe, that muſt relie on the credit of the reporters. Now for the Cardinall to avouch a doctrine of faith out of a rumour or report of how credible men themſelves knew not, from ſuch an uncertainty to collect, that Generals ought to relie on the aide of the bleſſed Virgin in their battels, and that ſhee, *interpellata precibus, being invocated by their prayers*, riſeth up, and becomes a warrier on their ſide; this, by none that are indifferent can be judged leſſe than exceeding temeri-

ty,

[e] *Proc. lib. 3. pa. 416.*

[f] *Evag. lib. 4. ca. 23.*

ty, and by those that are religious will bee condemned as plaine superstition and impiety. But let us returne now to *Anastasius*, whose narration, as it is untrue in it selfe, if the comming of *Narses* into *Italy*, and victory over the *Gothes*, bee referred to that time, when *Totilas* had before wonne *Rome*, so it is much more untrue, if it bee referred, as by *Binius* glosse it is, either to the yeare wherein the Emperour recalled his Edict, (which was never) or to the tenth yeare of *Totilas*, which was wholly ended before the comming of *Narses* into *Italie*, and before the fift Councell, and the Baronian banishment of *Vigilius*.

25. After the victory of *Narses* it followeth in *Anastasius*, *tunc adunatus Clerus*, *then the Romane Clergy joyned together*, besought *Narses* that hee would intreat the Emperour, that if as yet Pope *Vigilius*, with the Presbiters and Deacons that were carried into banishment with him, were alive, they might returne home. In that they speake of this exile, as long before begun, even so long that they doubted whether *Vigilius* were then alive or no, it seemeth evidently, that *Anastasius* still hath an eye to that banishment for the cause of *Anthimus*, after he had beene two yeares in *Constantinople*; that falling five[g] whole yeares before the victory of *Narses*, they had reason to adde, *si adhuc*, if *Vigilius* doe live as yet, that is, after so long time of banishment, remaine alive. Now seeing it is certaine, that *Vigilius* was not at that time (to wit, not within two yeares after his comming to *Constantinople*) banished, as by the fift generall Councell is[h] evident, it hence followeth, that as this Anastasian exile, so all the consequents depending thereon are nothing else but a meere fiction of *Anastasius*, without all truth or probability: for seeing *Vigilius* was not then banished, neither did the Romanes intreate *Narses*, nor *Narses* the Emperour for his delivery, nor the Emperour upon that send to recall him or them from exile, nor use any such words about *Pelagius*, not thanke them if they would accept *Vigilius*, not did they promise after the death of *Vigilius* to chuse *Pelagius*, nor did the Emperour dismisse them all (for of *Pelagius* that hee three yeares after the end of the Councell remained in banishment, is certainly testified by *Victor*[i]) nor did they returne from exile into *Sicilie*; all this is a meere fiction. So in this Catastrophe, beginning at the time when *Anastasius* saith *Totilas* was King of the Gothes, there are contained at least forty capitall untruths, to let passe the rest, as being of lesser note and moment. Let any now cast up the whole summe, I doubt not but hee shall finde, not onely, as I have said, so many untruths as there are lines, but (if one would strictly examine the matter) as there are words in the Anastasian description of the life of *Vigilius*; & I am verily perswaded, that few Popes lives scape better at his hands than this: But I have stayed long enough in declaring the falshood of *Anastasius*, on whom *Baronius* so much relyeth, and who is a very fit author for such an Annalist as *Baronius*.

g *Nam Vigilius venit Constantinopolim anno 12 belli Gothici. Proc. lib. 3. pa. 364. Narses autem Totilam vicit, et Romam recepit an. 18. ejusdem belli. Proc. lib 3. pa. 408. et seq.*

h *Nam ex eo liquet, Vigilium a primo ejus adventu Constantinopolim, illic mansisse ad finē Concilij, dicitur enim illic à Iustiniano, quod Vigilius semper ejusdem voluntatis fuit de condemnatione Trium Capitulorum. Conc. 5. Coll. 1. pa. 520. a Semper, viz. à primo ejus adventu et consensu ad tempus 5. Concily.*

i *Nam Victor ait Pelagium rediisse ab exilio anno 18. post Coss. Basily. Vill. Tun. in Chron. et Concilium habitum ait ille an. 13. post ejusdem Consulatum.*

Cap. XXXVI.

That Baronius *reproveth Pope Vigilius* for his comming to *Constantinople, and a refutation thereof; with a* description of the life of the same *Vigilius.*

1. AFter all which the Cardinall could deviſe to diſgrace either the Emperor or the Empreſſe, or *Theodorus* Biſhop of *Ceſarea*, or the cauſe it ſelfe of the *Three Chapters*, or the Synodall Acts; in the laſt place let us conſider what he ſaith againſt Pope *Vigilius*; for, this cauſe ſo netled him, that whatſoever or whoſoever came in his way, though it were his Holineſſe himſelfe, hee would not ſpare them, if he thought thereby to gaine never ſo little for the ſupport of their infallible Chaire: And what think you is it that he carps at, and for which hee ſo unmannerly quarrels Pope *Vigilius?* was it for oppugning the truth publiſhed by the Emp. Edict, or was it for making his hereticall *Conſtitution*, and defining it *ex Cathedrâ*, in defence of the *Three Chapters*? or was it for his peviſhneſſe in refuſing to come to the generall Councell, even then when he was preſent in the City where it was held, and had promiſed under his owne hand that hee would come unto it? or was it his pertinacious obſtinacy in hereſie, that he would rather undergoe both the juſt ſentence of an *anathema* denounced by the generall Councell, and alſo the calamity and wearineſſe of exile inflicted by the Emperor (as *Baronius* ſaith) upon him, then yeelding to the truth and true judgement of the Synod in condemning the *Three Chapters*? Are theſe (which are all of them hainous crimes, and notorious in *Vigilius*) the matters that offend the Cardinall? No, none of theſe, hee is not uſed to finde ſuch faults in their Popes, theſe all hee commends as rare vertues, as demonſtrations of conſtancy, of prudence, of fortitude in *Vigilius*? what then is it that his Cardinalſhip diſlikes? Truely, among many great and eminent vices in *Vigilius*, which are obvious, and runne into every mans ſight, it hapned that once in his life he did one thing worthy of commendations, and that was his obedience in going to *Conſtantinople*, when the Emperour [a] called and requeſted [b] him to come thither, and the Cardinall winking at all the other, reproves his Holineſſe for this one thing, which both in equity and duty hee ought to have done: This forſooth is it which hee notes as a very [c] dangerous and hurtfull matter, and a ſpeciall point of great indiſcretion in Pope *Vigilius*, that leaving *Rome*, that holy City, hee would goe to *Conſtantinople*, and to the Emperours Court, which his predeceſſors, *Leo* and others, in very great wiſdome would never do, nor goe into the Eaſt, nor ſuffer themſelves to bee pulled away from their See fixed at *Rome*.

2. Truely, I never knew before that there was ſuch vertue in the Romane, or ſuch venome in the Conſtantinopolitane ſoile, or in the Eaſterne

a *Vigilius ab Imperatore evocatus, Byzantium venit* Proc. *lib.* 3 *pa.* 364.

b *Ipſum ſummâ celeritate venire rogans.* Bar. *an.* 546. *nu.* 54.

c *Caterum Vigilij profectionem Conſtantinopolim, magnum intuliſſe Catholicæ Eccleſiæ damnum eventa declarârunt, quæ et ſignificarunt quam prudentiſſimè egerunt illius prædeceſſores, S. Leo, et alij, qui vocati ſæpe ab orthodoxis licet Imperatoribus nunquam paſſi ſunt ſe ab ipſâ fixâ Romæ ſede divelli, &c.* Bar. *an.* 546. *nu.* 55.

Easterne ayre, specially seeing the holy Land and the holy City, and the holy Temple were all in the East: All the Westerne nations are beholding to the Cardinall for this conceit, *Shall there not bee given to thy servant two Mules load of this Romish earth?* But let us a little more fully see why the Pope, and particularly *Vigilius* might not goe to *Constantinople*. Oh, saith the Cardinall [d], it is found by experience, that the Popes going from *Rome* to the Court, *obfuisse haud modicum*, hath done great hurt to the Church; for then partly by the threats, and partly by the favours and faire intreaties of Emperours, as it were with two contrary windes, the ship of *Peter* is exposed to great hazzard. *Medica fidei*, phy, a Cardinall to feare or distrust any wracke of Saint *Peters* ship, though never so dangerous a tempest happen, though, *Vna Eurusque, Notusque ruant, creberque procellis Africus*. S. *Peter* hath left such a Pilot in his *Rome*, that a thousand times sooner might he himselfe, than his ship sinke, *Pasce oves, tues Petra, & pravi pro te Petre*, will uphold it against all winde and weather: And truly I would gladly know of his Cardinalship for my learning, how any of their Popes can forsake their See or *Rome*. They have heretofore held it for a maxime, [e] *ubi Papa, ibi Roma*, let the Pope goe to Peru, yea, *ultra Garamantas & Indos*, he hath a priviledge above all creatures but the Snaile; hee carrieth not onely their infallible Chaire, but the whole City of *Rome* on his backe, whithersoever hee goes. If not so, or if the Chaire bee fixt to *Rome*, where sate all their Popes for those seventy yeares [f], when they were at *Avinion*? or how shall they sit in the Chaire, when their Babylonish Rome for her Idolatries shal be burnt with unquencheable fire, and sinke like a Milstone into the bottome of the Sea? which being foretold by Saint *John*, of the Romane City, which yet remaineth, as their owne Iesuite *Ribera* [g] doth truely and undeniably demonstrate, is a most certaine Article of the Catholike faith, though they seldome thinke of it, and will hardly put it into their Creed. When their Pope (goe whither hee will) carieth still with him his infallible Chaire, was it not infidelity in the Cardinall to dreame or doubt lest that ship should any where miscarry, more at the Court or Kings Pallace than in a Country Cottage; more in the Trullane than in the Laterane Temple?

3. Yea, but, *usu rerum reperitur* [h], experience teacheth, that their going to the Emperour hath done exceeding hurt, and particularly for *Vigilius*, that his going to *Constantinople* hath brought [i], *magnum damnum*, great harme to the Catholike Church, *declararunt eventa*, the events have shewed. Events and experience are the most woefull arguments in Divinitie, that can possibly be devised. Measure the Gospell by temporall calamities which ensued upon it, the bloody murdering of the Apostles, of the Saints of God, almost for three hundred yeares together, and hee may as well conclude, that the Gospell and truth of Christ is found by woefull experience to have brought exceeding great hurt to the Church. The Cardinall was driven to a narrow strait, and an exceeding penury of reasons, when he was forced to put, *Argumentum ab eventu*, for one of his *Topicall* places.

d Bar. loc. cit.

2 King. 5. 17.

e *Sententia illa omnium ore versata, Vbi Papa, ibi Roma.* Bar. an. 552. nu. 10.

f *Clemens 5. propter seditiones Italicas sedē Pontificiam ab urbe Roma, Avionem Galliæ urbem, ubi successores mansere annos 70. transtulit.* Geneb. in Chron. in an. 1305.

g *Iohannes in omnibus quæ dē Babylone loquitur, adversus urbem Romanam vaticinatur, &c.* Rib. Com. in ca. 14. Apoc. nu. 57. *et Vicarius Christi ubicunq; sit, erit Episcopus Romæ, etiamsi illa penitus excisa sit.* Ibid. nu. 48.

h *Obfuisse haud modicum usu rerum reperitur, Pontificum ab urbe profectio ad Comitatum.* Bar. an. 546. nu. 55.

i Ibid.

4. But

4. But ſay, what hurt can he tell us that ever any Emperours preſence with the Pope, brought unto the Church? If both were Catholike, or both hereticall, they agreed well enough together. As not Satans, ſo much leſſe is Gods Kingdome devided againſt it ſelfe; if the Emperour Catholike, and the Pope hereticall, the worſt the Emperour ever did, was but to inflict juſt puniſhment on an heretike, the worſt the Pope ſuſtained was but a juſt recompence of his hereſie and hatred of truth: The execution of Iuſtice never did, nor ever can hurt the Catholike Church. If the Emperor were hereticall and the Pope orthodoxal, there was trial of the Popes art & skil in converting ſuch a man to the truth; triall of his conſtancy and love unto Gods truth, whether by feare or favour he would forſake it: triall of his patience and fortitude in induring all torments, even death it ſelfe, for his love to Chriſt. All the hurt which ſuch an Emperour did, or could doe, was to crowne him a glorious Martyr, and in ſtead of the white garment of innocency, to ſend him in ſcarlet robes unto heaven; and woe be to that Church which ſhall thinke Martyrdome an hurt unto it, which was, and ever will bee the glory of the Catholike Church. *Non decet ſub ſpinoſo capite membrum eſſe delicatum*, when Chriſt, his Apoſtles, and glorious Saints, and Martyrs, have gone before upon thornes and briars, wee muſt not looke to have a ſilken way, ſtrewed with Roſes and Lillies, unto the Kingdome of God. This, which is yet the very worſt that can befall any Catholike, is no harme to him who hath learned that leſſon, *Bleſſed are they which die in the Lord*; ſo whether Pope and Emperour be both of one, or of a different religion, his preſence with the Emperour may happen to doe good, but it is certaine it can never poſſibly doe hurt unto the Church. The greateſt hurt that was ever done to the Church by this meanes, was when *Conſtantine* after his baptiſme by Pope *Silveſter*, in liew of his paines, and in token of a thankful minde, ſealed unto him that donation [k] of the Romane and Weſterne *Provinces*: That one fable I muſt particularly except, for by it hath beene lift up the man of ſinne, Chriſtian Empires have beene robbed, the ignorant ſeduced, the whole Church abuſed: *Nero* did not the thouſand part ſo much hurt by martyring *Peter* and *Paul* when they were preſent with him, as the moſt falſly ſuppoſed donation hath done to the Catholike Church.

Reu. 14. 13.

k *Donationis exemplar extat Diſt. 96. ca. Conſtantinus.*

5. Will you yet ſee the great vanity of the Cardinall in this reaſon drawne from the event, and the Emperours preſence. Some [l] ten yeares before this, Pope *Agapetus*, being ſent by *Theodotus* King of the Gothes, came to *Conſtantinople*, and to the ſame Emperour: It ſo fell out, that at that time *Anthimus* an heretike and an intruder, held the Sea of *Conſtantinople*: *Agapetus* depoſed him, that is, hee declared and denounced (which was true indeed) that hee was never lawfully Biſhop of that See, and that himſelfe did not, nor ought others to hold him for the lawfull Biſhop thereof; whereupon *Mennas* was choſen and conſecrated Biſhop by *Agapetus* in *Anthimus* his roome. *Vigilius* was called by the Emperour, *Agapetus* ſent by a Gothiſh uſurper; *Vigilius* called by a religious and moſt orthodoxall Profeſſor, *Agapetus* ſent by an heretike and Arian King; *Vigilius* called purpoſe-

l *Agapetus Barbarico coactus Imperio, &c. Bar. an. 536. nu. 10. qui Agapeti profectionem eo anno contigiſſe probat.*

ly

ly about cauſes of faith, *Agapetus* ſent only about civill, and but caſually intermedling w^th Eccleſiaſticall cauſes. You would now even bleſſe your ſelfe to ſee how the Card. here turns this argument *ab eventu*, & by it proves the Popes preſence at the ſame Court with the ſame Emperor, to have brought ſuch an infinite & unſpeakeable good unto the Church, as could ſcarce bee wiſhed. *Agapetus* [m] no longer ſent from *Theodotus* a barbarous Goth, but even from God himſelfe, and by him commanded to goe thither with an errant from heaven; hee ſeemed to bee ſent to intreat of peace, but hee was commanded by God to goe, *ut imperaret imperantibus*, *that he ſhould ſhew himſelfe to be an Emperour above the Emperour*: He, like Saint *Peter* [n], had not gold nor ſilver being faine to pawne the holy Veſſels for to furniſh him with money in the journey, but he was rich in the power and heavenly treaſures of working miracles. Now was demonſtrated [o] the higheſt power of the Pope, that without any Councell called about the matter, as the cuſtome is, hee could depoſe a Patriarke, (at other times hee may not have that title) and a Patriark of ſo high a See as *Conſtantinople*, and ſo highly favoured by the Emp. & Empreſſes. Now was demonſtrated [p], that, *Pontifex ſupra omnes Canones eminet*, *that the Popes power is above all Canõs*, for herby was ſhewed, that he by his omnipẽt authority may do matters with the Canons, without the Canons, againſt all Canons; & ſeeing his judgement was without a Synod, (w^ch in a Patriarks cauſe is required) *fuit ſecundum ſupremam Apoſtolicæ ſedis authoritatem*, *it was according to his ſupreme authority*, which is tranſcẽdent above all Canõs; or to uſe *Bellarmines* [q] phraſe, hee did ſhew himſelfe to bee, *Princeps Eccleſiæ*, one that may doe againſt the whole Church. Nay, if you well conſider [r], *admirari non deſines*, *you will never ceaſe to wonder*, to ſee that *Agapetus* a poore man, as ſoone as hee came to *Conſtantinople* ſhould *imperare Imperatoribus*, *corũ facta reſcindere*, *jura dare*, *omnibuſq; jubere*, *to command Emperours*, *to adnull their Acts*, *to depoſe a Patriarke and thruſt him from his throne*, *to ſet another there*, *to ſet downe lawes*, *and command all men*, and to do all this without any Synod: & ſuch a Pope [s] was *Agapetus*, that I know not, *an ſimilis alius inveniri poſsit*, whether ſuch another can bee found among them all. Thus declameth *Baronius*. Where thinke you, all time was the Cardinals argument *ab adventu*? Experience teacheth, that when Popes leave their See, and goe to the Court or Emperours preſence, the ſhip of S. *Peter* is then in great hazzard: If *Agapetus* his comming to *Conſtantinople* or to the Emperour did not hazzard or endanger the Church, how came it to bee perillous a few yeares after in *Vigilius*? and where were now the moſt wiſe examples of Pope *Leo* and the other, who in great wiſedome could never be drawne to the Eaſt, and from their owne See? how was the holy Church now fixed to *Rome*, when *Agapetus* had it in the greateſt majeſty and honour at *Conſtantinople*? perceive you not how theſe arguments lie aſleepe in the cauſe of *Agapetus*, which the Cardinall rouſeth up when *Vigilius* goes to *Conſtantinople*? This, *ab adventu*, as all the Cardinals Topicke places, is drawne from the art and authority of Eſops Satyr: If they make for the Pope, as the event did in *Agapetus*, then the Cardinall with his Satyrs blaſt will puffe them up and make them

m *Agapetus licet à Rege viſus ſit miſſus ad Imperatorem, à Deo tamen proficiſcis miſſus apparuit, ut imperaret imperantibus, &c.* Bar. an. 536. nu. 12.

n *Illud ipſum firme contigit Agapeto, quod olim Petro, &c.* Ibid. nu. 13.

o *In his omnibus peragendis ſumma poteſtas Apoſtolicæ ſedis Antiſtitis demonſtrata eſt, &c.* Ibid. nu. 22.

p Ibid. nu. 23.

q Bell. lib. 1. de Conc. ca. 18. *Pontifex et Princeps Eccleſiæ ſũmus, poteſt retractare judicium Concilij, et non ſequi majorem partem.*

r Bar. an. 536. nu. 31.

ſ Ibid. nu. 70.

them ſwell to demonſtrations: But if they make againſt the Pope, as did the event in *Vigilius*, all arguments in the world drawne from the cauſe, effect, or any other Topicall or demonſtrative place, the Cardinall with a contrary breath can turne them al to Sophiſtications. He is another *Iannes* or *Iambres* of this age, when any argument or Topick place is for the Romiſh *Pharao*, it ſhall ſting like a Serpent, when it is uſed againſt King *Pharao* it ſhall bee as dull and dead as a ſtick.

6. And yet what are thoſe ill events and dangers whereunto the Church was brought by the comming of *Vigilius* to *Conſtantinople*? what hurt received it by the preſence of the Pope with *Iuſtinian*? Sure the Cardinall in good diſcretion ſhould have expreſſed them, at leaſt ſome one of them, but hee was too politike to open ſuch ſecrets of their State; for mine owne part I cannot but firſt condemne his foule ingratitude in this point. *Vigilius* before hee came to *Conſtantinople*, was earneſt in oppugning the truth, and Catholike faith, by defending of the *Three Chapters*, hee defended them by words, by writings, by cenſures, by the utmoſt of his power: All the hurt the Emperour did him was this, that he converted him to the truth, that hee brought him to define, by an *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution*, that truth which before hee oppugned, and in this tune the Emperour kept him for five or ſixe yeares together, but then when his old fit of hereſie came upon him againe, when at the time of the generall Councell he forſook the Emperours holy faith, his communion, and, as may bee thought, even his company and preſence alſo, by this abſence from the Emperor, he relapſed quite from the Catholike faith, even from that which before hee had defended and defined, ſo long as hee kept ſociety with the Emperour. When the Emperours preſence made hereticall Pope *Vigilius* for the ſpace of five or ſixe yeares a Catholike Pope, (at leaſt in ſhew and profeſſion) doe you not thinke *Baronius* to deale unkindly with the Emperour in blaming the time that ever *Vigilius* came to the Emperour, that is in effect to blame, and little leſſe than curſe the day wherein *Vigilius* renounced hereſie, and embraced or made profeſſion of the Catholike faith.

7. Now as this good redownded to *Vigilius* in particular by his comming to *Conſtantinople*, ſo there is another and publike benefit which enſued thence to the whole Church, and that ſo great and ſo happy, that if we ſhould (as the Cardinall doth) meaſure things by the event, the comming of *Agapetus* to *Conſtantinople*, though they glory therein more than in any other example of antiquity, is no way comparable to this of *Vigilius*, for by this comming of *Vigilius* it was demonſtrated by evident experience, that the Pope may ſay and gainſay his owne ſayings in matters of faith, and then define *ex Cathedra*, both his ſayings, that is, two direct contradictories to be both true, ſeeing Pope *Vigilius*, firſt, while hee temporized with the Emperour defined *ex Cathedra*, that the *Three Chapters* ought to bee condemned, and after that, when it pleaſed him to open the depth of his owne heart, defined the quite contrary *ex Cathedra*, that the *Three Chapters* ought to bee defended. By it was further demonſtrated, that the Pope may not onely be an heretike, but teach alſo and define

fine, and that *ex cathedra*, an hereſie to be truth, and ſo be a convicted, condemned, and anathematized heretike, by the judgment of an holy generall Councell, and of the whole Catholike Church. Theſe and ſome other like concluſions of great moment for the inſtruction of the whole Church of God, are ſo fully, ſo clearly, ſo undenyably demonſtrated in the cauſe of Pope *Vigilius*, when he came to *Conſtantinople*, that had the Cardinall or his favourers (I meane the maintainers of the Popes infallibility,) grace to make uſe thereof for the opening of their eyes in that maine and fundamentall point, wherein they are now ſo miſerably blinded, they might have greater cauſe to thank God for his comming thither, than for the voyage of *Agapetus*, or of any other of his predeceſſors undertaken in many yeares before.

8. Where are now the great hurts and inconveniences which the Cardinall fancieth by *Vigilius* his comming to the Emperour? Truly I cannot deviſe, what one they can finde, but the diſgrace onely of *Vigilius*, in that upon his comming he ſhewed himſelfe to be a temporizer, a very weather-cocke in faith, a diſſembler with God and his Church, pretending for five or ſix yeares that hee favoured the truth, when all that time he harboured in his breſt the deadly poyſon of that hereſie, which as before his comming he defended, ſo at the time of the Councell he defined. This blot or blemiſh of their holy Father, neither I, nor themſelves, with all the water in Tiber, can waſh or ever wipe away. The beſt uſe that can be made of it, is, that as *Thomas* diſtruſted, to make others faithfull and void of diſtruſt; ſo God, in the infiniteneſſe of his wiſedome, permitted Pope *Vigilius* to be not only unconſtant, but hereticall in defining cauſes of faith, that others by relying on the Popes judgement as infallible, might not be hereticall: and yet even for this very fact, thus much I muſt needs ſay, that if the Cardinall thinke it was the place, or the City of *Conſtantinople*, that wrought this diſgracefull effect in *Vigilius*, it may bee truly replyed unto him much like as *Themiſtocles* [t] did to the fooliſh *Seriphian*, aſcribing his owne ignobility to the baſeneſſe of the towne of *Seriphus*, certainly though *Silveſter*, *Iulius*, and *Caleſtine* had beene never ſo oft at *Conſtantinople*, they had beene orthodoxall and heroicall Biſhops; but *Vigilius* hereticall and ignoble, though he had beene nayled to the poſts of the Vaticane, or chained to the pillars of it as faſt as *Prometheus* to *Caucaſus*. The ſoyle and ayre is as Catholike at *Conſtantinople*, as in the very Laterane; it is as hereticall in Rome, as in any City in all the world. The onely difference is in the men themſelves, the former, where ever they had come, caried with them conſtant, heroicall, and truly pontificall minds; *Vigilius* in every place was of an ambitious, unſtable, diſſembling, hypocriticall, and hereticall ſpirit: which that every one may perceive, I will now in the laſt place, and inſtead of an Epilogue to this whole Treatiſe, ſet downe a true deſcription of the life of *Vigilius*: partly becauſe it may bee thought a great wrong to reject the narration of *Anaſtaſius*, and not ſome way to ſupply that defect, touching the life of ſo memorable a Pope as was *Vigilius*; partly with a true report of this hereticall Popes life, to requite the labour of *Baronius*, in his malitious ſlanders of the religious Empe-

[t] *Cic. lib. de Senect.*

Emperour *Iustinian*; and specially becauſe *Vigilius* being the ſubject, (in a manner) of this whole Treatiſe, it ſeemes to mee needfull to expreſſe the moſt materiall circumſtances, touching the entrance, the actions, the end of him, who hath occaſioned us to undertake this ſo long, and as I truly profeſſe, both laborious and irkſome labour.

9. I confeſſe I have no good faculty in writing their Popes lives, *Nec fonte labra prolui Caballino, nec in bicipiti ſomniaſſe Parnaſſo memini*; I have not taſted of their ſtreames of *Tiber*, more holy than *Helicon*, nor ever had I dreame or viſion in their ſacred *Parnaſſus*; yet with their leave will I adventure to ſet downe ſome parts of the life of *Vigilius*, which doe afford as much variety of matter, and are as needfull to be knowne and remembred, as any other of that whole ranke from S. *Peter* to *Paul* the fift.

10. That many of their Popes have unjuſtly climbed up to S. *Peters* Chaire, I thinke none ſo unskilfull as not to know, none ſo malitious as to deny: But whether any of them all, I except none, not the boy-Pope [u] *Iohn* the 12. not the Fox [x] *Boniface*, not *Silveſter* the ſecond, who had it [y] by a compact with the Devill, of whom hee purchaſed it with the gift of his ſoule; not *Iohn* the 23. called a Devill incarnate [z], not any elſe; whether any of them all, I ſay, obtained the See with more impiety, or greater villany than *Vigilius*, may be juſtly doubted. He, intending to be a good cammock, beganne (according to the Proverb,) to hooke and crooke betimes, and gape after that eminent Throne. His firſt attempt [a] was in the time of *Boniface* the ſecond, with whom he prevailed ſo far, that when *Boniface* [b] in a Roman Synod had made a Conſtitution that he ſhould nominate his ſucceſſor, before them all he named and conſtituted *Vigilius* to ſucceed to himſelfe: for the performance of which, both he and all the reſt of the Synod did binde themſelves, both by ſubſcription, and by a ſolemne oath. *Vigilius* ſeemed for a while to be cocke-ſure of the See: but it fell out contrary to his expectation at this time: the Senate of Rome juſtly withſtood (as Pope *Silverius* [c] witneſſeth) that nomination. It may be they knew the crooked diſpoſition of *Vigilius*, how unfit hee was to make a Biſhop: nor the Senate onely, but the Eccleſiaſticall Canons reſiſted it: Thou endeavoureſt this *contra jura canonica*, ſaith Pope *Silverius* [d], *againſt the Canonicall right*. The Italian lawes alſo reſiſted it at that time; *Theodorick* [e], and after him *Odoacer* [f], having enacted, and that as they affirme by the advice of Pope *Simplicius*, *electionem Romani Pontificis ad Regem ſpectare, that the election of the Pope ſhould belong to the King*; and that no election ſhould be made without the conſent of the King of *Italy*, as by the fourth Romane Councell under *Symmachus* doth appeare: For which cauſe *Boniface* called a ſecond Synod to *Rome*, wherein he recalled [g] his nomination of *Vigilius*, and

u *De quo Otho Imperator dixit poſtquam ſcidiſſet 8. annos, Puer eſt: erat enim cum invaſit ſedem non niſi annorum 18. Bar. an. 955. nu. 1. & 2. Cujus electioni lex nulla ſuffragata eſt, ſed vis & metus omnia implevêrunt. ibid. n. 3.*

x *De quo dicitur, Intravit ut vulpes, regnavit ut leo, mortuus eſt ut Canis. Geneb. in ſuo Chron. ad an. 1303.*

y *Pontificatum adjuvante diabolo conſequutus eſt, hac tamen lege, ut poſt mortem totus illius eſſet. Plat. in Silv. 2.*

z *Johannes inter Chriſti fideles, vitam & mores ejus cognoſcentes, vulgariter dicitur Diabolus incarnatus. Conc. Conſtan. Seſſ. 11. pa. 1579.*

a *Contra jura canonica, temporibus Bonifacij Papæ, ipſo vivente, ſucceſſor ejus deſignari conaberis. Epiſt. 1. Silverij quæ eſt ad Vigilium.*

b *Bonifacius 2. congregavit Synodum, & fecit Conſtitutum ut ſibi ſucceſſorem nominaret, quo Conſtituto, cum chirographis Sacerdotum, et jurejurando, Diaconum Vigilium conſtituit. Anaſt. in vita Bonif. 2.* c *Ampliſſimi Senatus tibi obviavit juſtitia. Silv. Epiſt. 1.* d *Ibid.* e *Electionem Rom. Pontificis ad Regem ſpectare Theodoricus ſtatuerat. Bar. an 531. nu 2.* f *Baſilius vices agens Odoacris dixit, Admonitione beatiſſimi Papæ Simplicij, hoc nobis ſub obteſtatione meminiſſe fuiſſe mandatum, ut non ſine noſtra conſultatione, hujuſmodi (Pontificis) celebretur electio. Conc. 4. ſub Symmacho. Et, lex una Odoacris erat, ne abſque conſultatione & conſenſu Regis Italiæ, electio ſummi Pontificis fieret. Bin. Notis in illud Conc. 4.* g *Bonifacius facta iterum Synodo reum ſe Majeſtatis confeſſus eſt quod Diaconum Vigilium conſtituiſſet, acceptum conſtitutum incendio conſumpſit. Anaſt. in vit. Bonif. 2.*

burned

burned his former Conſtitution, acknowledging himſelfe (and by conſequence all the reſt of the former Synod) to bee *reus Majeſtatis, guilty of high treaſon*, for preſuming to name *Vigilius*. This was the firſt onſet of *Vigilius*, ſeeking the Papacy both by violation of the Canons, and treaſon againſt the King, and perjury of the Pope, and of the whole Synod, whom he had cunningly drawne to that ſnare, either by making him Pope to incurre treaſon, or by defeating him of it to incurre perjury.

11. *Hâc non ſucceßit*, he could not by ſuch petty offences, as treaſon, perjury, and contempt of the Canons prevaile: about he will againe, and try another courſe, and that is by treaſon againſt Chriſt himſelfe, and abnegation of the Catholike faith. For after the death, firſt of his old friend *Boniface*, then of *Iohn* the ſecond, then of *Agapetus*, who died at *Conſtantinople*; *Vigilius*, that he might effect his purpoſe, tampered and conſulted with the Empreſſe *Theodora*, who though of her ſelfe at that time ſhe was too earneſtly affected to *Anthimus*, and being by him ſeduced, ſought for his cauſe to overthrow the Councell of *Chalcedon*; yet *Inſtigabat* [h] *ardentem Vigilium*; *Vigilius incited her by his ambitious deſires*. She and *Vigilius* the Deacon having adviſed about the matter, and covenanted, it was concluded betwixt them, as *Liberatus* [i] ſheweth, that the Empreſſe for her part ſhould procure *Vigilius* to be Pope, and give him 700. peeces [k] of gold; and that *Vigilius* for his part, and in recompence of ſo ample wages, and ſo great a reward, ſhould when he were Pope, aboliſh [l] and adnull for ever the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and reſtore *Anthimus*, *Theodoſius*, and *Severus*, three Eutychean Biſhops to their Sees. The words of *Liberatus* are very worthy obſerving: *Libenter ſuſcepit Vigilius promiſſum ejus, amore epiſcopatus, & auri*; *Vigilius gladly tooke the offer, for his deſire both of the Popedome, and of the pounds of gold.* O ambition, *& auri ſacra fames*, what will not it effect in ſuch a *Balaam*, ſuch a *Iudas* as *Vigilius* was? It was a very bitter ſcoffe, and ſome touch alſo to the credit of Pope *Damaſus*, that *Prætextatus* [m] an heathen man ſaid in deriſion of him, *Facite me Romanæ urbis Epiſcopum, & ero protinus Chriſtianus*, *make me Pope, and I will be a Chriſtian:* But ſee the difference betwixt this heathen man and *Vigilius*; *Prætextatus* would renounce paganiſme, and become a Chriſtian, ſo hee might gaine the Popedome thereby; *Vigilius* will renounce Chriſt and Chriſtianity, and turne quite Pagan, to obtaine the ſame honour. What thinke you would *Vigilius* have ſayd to him that made the offer, *All theſe will I give thee and fall downe and worſhip me*, when he was ſo glad for the offer of 700. peeces of gold, and the triple Crowne; that for them onely he undertakes, and bindes himſelfe in an obligation under his owne hand to renounce Chriſt, and abandon out of the world the whole Catholike faith? Which is every whit as bad, if not all one with falling downe to adore the Devill. *Vigilius* having now the Empreſſe warrant, ſeemed ſure and ſecure of the Papacy, and in this confidence hee [n] poſts from *Conſtantinople* to *Rome*: but it fell out ſo unhappily, that when he came, he found [o] *Silverius* placed by *Theodotus*, & holding quiet and peaceable poſſeſſion of the See. This had beene enough to have

h *Blond. Decad. 1. lib. 5. in initio.*
i *Lib. in Brev. ca. 22.*
k *Promittens dare centenaria ſeptem, (tuta auri, nam duo ex his centenaria auri Vigilius Beliſario promiſit.) Lib. loc. cit. Videntur autem fuiſſe aurei illi qui à Valentiniano cuſi Sextala aiebantur, quod eſſent ſexta pars unciæ. Aureus autem quiſque tali valebat de noſtro nummo 10. s. ut obſervat doctiſſim. vir Edw. Breinwood. lib. ſuo de antiquis nummis. ca. 15. Ita ſumma Vigilio promiſſa fuit 350. li.*
l *Auguſta vocans Vigilium profiteri ſibi ſecreto ab eo flagitavit, ut ſi Papa fieret, tolleret Synodi, & fidem ſi maret Anthimo, &c Liber. loc. cit.*
m *Hier. Epiſt. ad Pammach. adverſus err. Iohannis Hieroſ.*

March 49.

n *Vigilius facta profeſſione (Theodoræ) Romam profectus eſt. Liber. loc. cit.*
o *Invenit Silverium, Papam ordinatum. Lib.*

diſcouraged a faint heart: but *Vigilius* was of a better courage: though he found it not, he will make the See vacant. He comes to *Belliſarius*; *Sinite me præterire*, how gladly would I paſſe by this fact and fault of *Belliſarius*, one for warlike prowes, wiſedome, and ſucceſſe, inferiour to no Generall that *Rome* ever had, by whom the Perſians were ſubdued, the Vandals expelled *Africke*, the Gothes out of *Italy*, the Empire reſtored with an overplus alſo to his priſtine beauty and dignity! But it ſo fals out that all men, even the moſt praiſe-worthy, yea the moſt holy, *Abraham*, *Lot*, *Sampſon*, *Peter*, and the reſt, they all have ſome blemiſh or other, like a moale or wart in a faire body, they muſt all be commended as God himſelfe praiſed [p] *David*, with an exception of that one matter of *Vriah*: *Peter* a moſt holy Apoſtle, ſavé onely in the matter of denying Chriſt. *Belliſarius*, a moſt worthy and renowned man, ſave this one matter of *Silverius*. To this renowned *Belliſarius* comes *Vigilius*, and delivered unto him [q] *præceptum Auguſtæ*, the Empreſſe mandatory letters to make him Pope; and to perſwade him more eaſily, knowing what ſtrong operation gold had in himſelfe, *Duo* [r] *ei auri centenaria promiſit*; *he promiſed to part ſtakes with him, and give him two hundred pieces of gold.* I wiſh any but *Belliſarius* had beene the inſtrument of ſo vile an action. But ſo it was, either the command of the Empreſſe, or the importunity of *Vigilius*, or both, cauſed him to condemne [s] Pope *Silverius* as guilty of treaſon, for practiſing to betray the Imperiall City of *Rome* to the Gothes, under pretence of which falſe accuſation, (for I cannot aſſent to *Marcellinus* [t], who thinks *Silverius* guilty thereof) *Silverius* was expelled [u] and thruſt away, and then *Vigilius* by the ſame meanes of *Belliſarius* intruded himſelfe, and ſtept into the *Apoſtolicall* See, uſurping it about two yeares [x] during the life time of *Silverius*: all which time he caried himſelfe [y] for the onely lawfull Pope; as Pope he received [z] Letters from *Iuſtinian*, as Pope he gave anſwer [a] and judgemeut to *Etherius*, to *Cæſarius* [b], as true and Catholike, you may be ſure, as if S. *Peter* had given them: the Chaire would not permit him to ſpeake amiſſe.

12. Now though it was too bad for any Pope, to enter into the holy throne of S. *Peter*, by open injuſtice, by ſlander, and falſe accuſations, by a ſacrilegious extruſion of the lawfull Biſhop, by Symonie, by undertaking to reſtore condemned heretikes, and to aboliſh the holy Councell of *Chalcedon*, which is in effect utterly to abandon the whole Catholike faith; yet the ſequell of his actions bewrayes further the moſt devilliſh minde of *Vigilius*. Who would have thought but that *Vigilius* would have kept touch, and performed his ſacrilegious and ſymoniacall contract with the Empreſſe and *Belliſarius*? *Liberatus* [c] notes of him that he would doe neither, not reſtore *Anthimus*, *timore Romanorum*, it was not out of conſcience, he feared the people, he feared his owne life: Not pay the 200. *Centenaria* to *Belliſarius*, *avaritia patrocinante*, better loſe all his credit, faith, and honeſty, than two hundred peeces of gold; better break his promiſe, than hurt his purſe: But all this is nothing to his uſage of Pope *Silverius*: Was it not e-

nough

p 1 Reg. 15. 5.
q Liber loc. cit. & miſit Auguſta ſuaſiones ſuas ad Belliſarium per Vigilium Anaſt. in vita Silver.
r Liber. loc. cit.
s Intentabat Silverio calumniã quaſi Gothis ſcripſiſſet ut Romam introirent. Liber. loc. cit. & Exierunt quidam falſi teſtes qui dixerunt, Invenimus Silverium, &c. Anaſt. in vita Silv.
t Marc. in Chron. an. 547. Silverium faventem Vitigi, Belliſarius ſubmovit.
u Obrta ſuſtucione Silverium defectum ad Gothos tranſmiſit in Græciam Belliſarius, & Vigilium ſuffecit. Proc. lib. 1. de bell. Goth pa. 286 Belliſarius mandavit eis ut alium Papam eligerent, & favore Belliſarij ordinatus eſt Vigilius. Liber loc. cit.
x Hoc anno (548) expulſus eſt Vigilius. Bar an. 547. nu. 21. obijt autem Silverius a. 540. Bar. an. 540 nu. 2.
y Vigilius quæ Pontificij muneris erant, exequi nunquã pretermiſit. Bar. an. 538. nu. 21
z Hæc eadem ſcripſiſſimus ad beatiſſ. Papam ſenſoris Roma Vigilium. ſic ait Iuſtin. in ſuis literis ad Menn. quæ extant apud Bar. an. 538. nu. 34 & 77. Illam autem epiſtolam miſſam ram Mennam quã ad Vigilium, ſixto anno 547. ex hoc liquet, quod hæ literæ Concilium illud Conſtantinopolitanum præcedat, in quo Origines damnatus eſt, nam Mennam admovet Imp. ut Synodum de hac re habeat. Epiſt apud Bar. n. 77. Concilium autẽ illud habitum eſt ſixo anno. teſtatur Bar. an 538. nu. 31 & nu. 83.
a Bar an. 538. nu. 21. & 25. Legitimorum Pontificũ veſtigijs inſiſtit.
b Epiſt. 2. Vigilij, apud Bin. pa. 482.
c Vigilius poſt ordinationem ſuam compellabatur a Belliſario ut impleret promiſionem ſuam Auguſtæ, & ſibi redderet duo auri centenaria promiſſa. Vigilius autem timore Romanorum, & avaritia patrocinante nolebat ſponſiones ſuas implere. Liber. loc. cit.

nough to uſurpe and violently thruſt himſelfe into his See, to ſet up *altare contra altare*, Pope againſt Pope, S. *Peters* Chaire againſt S. *Peters* Chaire, but hee muſt adde indignities alſo to the holy Biſhop? Had he permitted him to live in his owne Country, in ſome quiet, though meane eſtate, it had beene ſome contentment to innocent *Silverius*: But *Vigilius* could not endure that, away with him, out of *Rome*, out of *Italy*, out of *Europe*. So by *Vigilius* meanes is *Silverius* ſent to *Patara*, a City in *Licia*[e], once famous for the Temple and Oracle of *Apollo*[f]: there hee is fed with the bread of tribulation, and with the water of affliction. But the rage of *Vigilius* was further incenſed by two occaſions, the former on *Silverius* part. He, though in exile, yet as then being the onely true and lawfull Pope, in a Councell held * at *Patara*, by the authority of S. *Peter*, and the fulneſſe of his *Apoſtolicall* power, thundred out from *Patara* a ſentence of excommunication, of depoſition, of damnation againſt the uſurper and invader of his See, *Vigilius*. Which being an authenticke and undenyable record of the good conditions of *Vigilius*, and how fit a man he was to make a Pope, I will relate here ſome parts thereof. Pope[g] *Silverius* having told *Vigilius* how he ſought againſt law to obtaine the Papall dignity in the time of *Boniface* the ſecond, addes this, At that[h] time the paſtorall and pontificall authority ſhould have cut away, *execranda tua auſpicia, thy execrable beginnings*, but by neglect a little wound *inſanabile accrevit apoſtema, is become an incurable impoſtume*, which being ſenſleſſe of other medicines, is to be cut off with a ſword. *For thou art led*[i] *with the audacious neſſe of the moſt wicked fiend, thou art franticke with ambition, thou laboureſt to bring the crime of error or hereſie into the Apoſtolike See; thou followeſt the ſteps of Simon Magus, whoſe diſciple thou ſheweſt thy ſelfe to be, by thy workes, by giving money, by thruſting out me, and invading my See: Receive thou therefore this ſentence of damnation, ſublatum à tibi nomen, & miniſterium ſacerdotalis dignitatis agnoſce; and know that thou art deprived of the name, and all function of prieſtly miniſtery, being damned by the judgement of the holy Ghoſt, and by the Apoſtolike authority in us:* for it is fit, *ut quod habuit amittat, that hee ſhould loſe that which he hath received, who uſurpes that which he hath not received.* Thus *Silverius*: who being then the onely true Pope, pronounced this ſentence of deprivation, of degradation, and damnation out of the higheſt authority of their *Apoſtolike* Chaire: which alone is ſo authenticall a teſtimony, of the moſt execrable conditions of *Vigilius*, that if I ſaid no more, few Logicians I thinke would complaine that the deſcription of *Vigilius* were imperfect, being ſo fully, ſo plainly, and ſo infallibly expreſſed, both by his *Genus*, a damnable and damned intruder, and by his foure *differences*, or at leaſt properties, *hereticall, ſchiſmaticall, ſymoniacall, Satanicall.*

13. This no doubt moved the choler of *Vigilius* not a little, to heare ſuch a thundring from *Patara*, as if *Apollo* were there ſet againe on his ſacred trevet. But the other accident was farre worſe than this. For perhaps *Vigilius* had learned that maxime which *Lewis*[k] the French King ſometime uttered, That hee who feared the Popes curſe ſhould never ſleepe a quiet night. Many other Catholikes, and among them the Biſhop of *Patara* grieved much to ſee the injury and ignominy of

[e] *Pomp. Mel. in Lib. 1. in Licia.*
[f] *Vnde Patareus Apollo dictus. Vad. in Pom. Mel. loc. cit.*

* *Silverius habito illic Concilio Epiſcoporum in Vigilium ſententiam damnationis intorquet. Bar. an. 538. nu. 18. & Vigilio veniente Patarem venerabilis Epiſcopus, &c. Liber. loco cit.*

[g] *Silverij Epiſt. 1 qua eſt ad Vigilium pſeudopapam.*
[h] *Viz. tempore Bonifacij.*
[i] *Nequiſſimi ſpiritus audacia, ambitionis phreneſin concipiens. Silv. ibid.*

[k] *Contin. of the Hiſtory of France, collect. by Thomas Dauet, in Lewes 11 in fine.*

the innocent and miſerably afflicted Biſhop *Silverius*, went[l] to the Emperour to plead on his behalfe; declaring both his innocency and extreme oppreſſion. The Emperour whoſe delight it was to doe juſtice to all, and relieve the innocent, eſpecially ſacred perſons, and moſt of all the Pope, was ſo affected therewith, that he commanded that[m] *Silverius* ſhould be brought againe from exile to *Rome*, and that there ſhould be taken a *melius inquirendum* of the whole cauſe, and if he were found guilty of the treaſon objected, then hee ſhould be for ever exiled; if innocent, he ſhould be reſtored to his See, which *Vigilius* then uſurped. *Silverius*[n] was hereupon brought backe with ſpeed, and being come as neare as *Italy*, *Vigilius* was then netled indeed, and fearing[o] to be dethroned, he beſtirres himſelfe, and ſtirres every ſtone. Then he comes againe in very earneſt manner to *Belliſarius*, and tels him he will now performe all his covenants, if he would deliver *Silverius* to his cuſtody. By which ſollicitation *Silverius* the lambe was committed to the wolfe, who (intending now to make as ſure worke with him, as he who ſayd[p], *mortui non mordent*,) by two of[q] his ſervants convayed him out of *Italy* to the Iland *Palmaria*, where after all other injuries, indignities, and calamities, hee ſpared not the innocent life and ſoule of that holy Biſhop, but murdered him by a kinde of languiſhing death, namely by famine, which[r] *Vegetius* and the Prophet[s] alſo judged worſe than the ſword.

14. And now that which onely hindred *Vigilius*, being by a ſtrong writ *de ejectione mundi* quite removed, there was none to make oppoſition againſt him, or hinder his exaltation to the *Zenith* of Pontificall dignity, but onely God, and the ſting of his owne moſt guilty conſcience, both which (though you may be ſure he lightly regarded, yet) for abundant caution he by a fine ſleight and policy will pacifie and appeaſe: for as hitherto he had played the Wolfe and Tiger, ſo now you ſhall ſee him act the Foxe: and that in ſo lively and native manner, that hee meaneth to cozen not onely all men, but his owne conſcience, and Almighty GOD himſelfe. As hee had murdered the true & lawfull Pope *Silverius*, ſo in token of remorſe he will needs die & kill himſelfe alſo, being the uſurping Pope: but his death is no other than they fancy of Antichriſt the beaſt in the Apocalyps; he dyeth, but within few dayes he revives againe. He conſidered he had entred violētly & injuriouſly into the See; that he was as yet nothing but a mere intruder and uſurper of it; the holy & conſcionable man will not hold his dignity by ſo bad a title: and therefore[t] *abdicat ſe pontificatu, he puts off his Popedome*; & conſidering[u] how he was blemiſhed with Symony, hereſie, murder, and other crimes, that he was alſo excommunicated and accurſed, *à ſede male occupata deſcendit*, he forſakes & comes downe from the papall chaire, and reſignes the keies into the hands of S. *Peter* or Chriſt, and makes the See void, that there might be a new election of a lawfull Pope. They ſhall chuſe freely whom they will, as for himſelf, either they ſhall bring him by a lawfull election in at the doore, or he (ſo cōſcionable is the Fox now become) wil for ever ſtand without: climbe in at the window he will no more; either Chriſt himſelfe ſhall reach the keyes unto him, that hē may be his lawfull Vicar, or open and ſhut who will for *Vigilius*. Thus by the death of *Silverius*, the

l *Venerabilis Patara Epiſcopus venit ad Imperatorem, & judicium Dei conteſtatus eſt, de tanta ſedis expulſione, &c.* Liber. loc. cit.

m *Imperator revocari Romam Silverium juſſit, & de literis illis (à Silverio ut aiebant ad Gothos ſcriptis) judicium fieri, ut ſi probaretur &c.* Liber. loc. cit.

n *Prævalente Imperatoris juſſione Silverius ad Italiam reductus eſt.* Liber. ibid.

o *Cujus adventu territus Vigilius ne ſede pelleretur, Belliſario mandavit, Trade mihi Vigilium, alioquin non poſſum facere, quod à me exigis.* Liber. ibid.

p *Dictum Theodoti de Pomp. io, apud Plut. in vita Pomp.*

q *Ita Silverius traditus eſt ductibus Vigilij ſervis, qui in Palmariam inſulam adductus, ſub eorum cuſtodia defecit inedia.* Liber. loc. cit.

r *Ferro ſævior eſt fames.* Veget. ſ *Lament. 4. 9. Melius eſt mori gladio, quam fame.*

t Bin. Not. in vitam Vigilij.

u Bar. an. 540. nu. 4.

the true and lawful Pope, and by the abdication or reſignation (which is a death in law) of the uſurping Pope *Vigilius*, the See is wholly vacant, and that was, as *Anaſtaſius* [x] witneſſeth, for the ſpace of ſixe dayes.

15. In this vacancy of the See *Baronius* not onely tels you, that there was (wch is not unlike) very great deliberatiõ about the election of a new Pope, but, as if hee had beene preſent in the very conclave at that time, or as if by ſome Pythagoricall *metempſeuchoſis* the ſoules of ſome of thoſe Electors, comming from one beaſt to another, had at laſt entred into the Cardinals breaſt, declares their whole debatement of the matter, *pro & con*, what was ſaid for *Vigilius*, what againſt *Vigilius*; which kinde of poetry, if any be pleaſed with, they may have abundance of it in his Annals; for my ſelfe, I told you before I never dreamed as yet in their Romane *Parnaſſus*, that I dare preſume to vent ſuch fictions & fancies: In that one he ſounded the depth indeed both of *Vigilius* counſels, and of the conſultations of the Electors; Of *Vigilius* hee ſaith [y], *that hee gave over the Popedome, not with any purpoſe to leave it, but, as it were, to act a part in a comedy, and ſeeme to doe that which he never meant*, & that he did it, [z] *fretus potentia Belliſarij, quod eſſet eum mox iterum conſcenſurus; becauſe he knew, that by the meanes of Belliſarius hee ſhould ſhortly after bee elected and placed in it againe*; or, to uſe the Cardinals own compariſon, he did not play [a] at mum chance, but knowing how the election would goe after hee had given over, *haud dubiam jecit aleam, hee knew what his caſt would be, and what ſide of the Die would fall upward*, hee knew his caſt would bee better than *jactus venereus*, it would be the caſt of the triple Crowne; As for the Electors [b] he tels us, *that they choſe him not for any worth, piety, vertue, or ſuch like Pontificall qualifications*, (of which they ſaw none in him) *but to avoid* [c] *a ſchiſme in the Church*, becauſe they knew if they ſhould chooſe another, the Empreſſe and *Belliſarius* would maintaine the right of *Vigilius*, and as they had thruſt him in, ſo they would uphold and maintaine him in the See, and for this cauſe, at the inſtance of *Belliſarius*, they all with one conſent choſe their old friend *Vigilius*, and now make him the true and lawfull Pope, the undoubted Vicar of Chriſt, which was a fine caſt indeed at the Dies.

16. Now though this may ſeeme unto others, to demonſtrate great baſeneſſe and puſilanimitie in the Electors at that time, who fearing a little ſtorme of anger or perſecution, would place ſo unworthy a man in the Papall throne, and though it teſtifie the preſent Romane policy to be ſuch, that if *Simon Magus*, nay, the devill himſelf can once but be intruded into their Chaire, & put in poſſeſſion thereof, he ſhall be ſure to hold it, with the Electors conſent, if hee can but ſtorme and threaten in a Pilates voyce to incenſe the Emperour, or ſome potent King to revenge his wrong; if they ever chooſe any other; yet the Cardinal who was privy to the myſteries of their Conclave, commends [d] this for *ſalubre conſilium*, a very wholeſome advice; & wiſely was it done to chuſe *Vigilius*, nay, as if that were too little, he adds, it was, *Divinitus inſpiratum conſilium, God himſelf inſpired this divine counſell from heaven into their hearts*, rather to chooſe an ambitious,

[x] *Ceſſavit Epiſcopatus dies ſex. Anaſt. in vit. Silv. Ex quibus intelligas Vigilium qui ſedem uſurpaſſet ad hoc tempus, minimè diutius ſedere perſeveraſſe.* Bar. an. 540. nu. 4

[y] *Bar. an. 540. nu. 5. quod Vigilius id fecerit tanquam repreſentans in ſcena comœdiam, non ex animo, facilè mihi perſuadeo.*

[z] *Bar. ibid. nu. 4. Et, vaſer homo, hujuſmodi ſibi viam aperiendi curavit, ut ob perpetrata delicta ejici inde nũquam poſſet, ſecurus de Belliſarij voluntate, &c. Bar. an. cod. 540. nu. 5.*

[a] *Haud dubiam jecit aleam, cum ſciret eandem quam vellet, facilè rediturum. Bar. ib. nu. 5.*

[b] *Clerus longè abhorret, ut hominem tot criminibus implicatum in ſedem ſeveret Pontificiam, id præſertim ſacris Eccleſiæ legibus prohibentibus, et omnes, ut ab execrando facinore, ab ejus electione, longè longius abhorrent. Bar. an. 540. nu. 7.*

[c] *Contra, accuratius rem expendentes manifeſtè cernebant ſi aliquem alium eligerent, ſcindendam mox fore Eccleſiam diro ſchiſmate, ideo divinitus inſpirato conſilio evehunt ipſum in Pont. thronũ, &c. Bar. an. 540. nu. 7. & 8.*

[d] *Bar. ibid. nn. 8.*

ous, an hypocriticall, a Symoniacall, a schismaticall, an hereticall, a perfidious, a perjured, a murderous, a degraded, an accursed, a diabolicall person to be their Pope, rather than hazzard to sustain a snuffe of *Bellisarius*, or a frowne of *Theodoraes* countenance. Howsoever, chosen now *Vigilius* was by commō consent; and *solennibus* [e] *ritibus*, made the true and lawfull Pope from thence forward; and with all solemnity of their rites placed in the Papall throne, and put, not onely in the lawfull, but quiet and peaceable possession thereof, the whole Romane Church approving and applauding the same. Thus *Vigilius* at last got what in his ambitious desires hee so long gaped and thirsted after: At the first onset hee sought the Papacy, but got it not; at the second turne hee got it, but by usurpation and intrusion onely; but now at this third and last boute hee hit the marke indeed, hee got the rightfull possession of it, and is now become what hee would bee, the true Bishop of *Rome*, and Vicar of S. *Peter*.

16. I have stayed somewhat long in the entrance of *Vigilius*, and yet because I have set downe no more but a very σκέλετον, a naked & undecked narration, or as it were, onely rough hewed; I must pray the reader that hee will permit mee to set downe some few exornations and polishments of it out of Cardinall *Baronius*, for though all men knew him to bee one, whose words concerning their Popes are as smooth as oyle, and who will bee sure to say no more ill of any of them, than meere necessity and evidence of truth inforceth him, yet so unfit am I to write their Popes lives, that for want of fit termes I am inforced to borrow from him the whole garnish and varnish of this Description of *Vigilius*; heare then no longer mee, but the great Cardinall, the deare friend of *Vigilius*, telling you what a worthy man the Electors at this time chose for their Pope: heare him defining *Vigilius* in this manner; Hee was an ambitious [f] Deacon, who by a madde [g] desire, burned with pride, whom thirst [h] of vaine glory drove into madnesse, and into the hellish gulfe, by meanes whereof he makes shipwracke in the very haven, becomes a Rocke of offence, and seemes an infidell in faith; a bondslave [i] to impious and hereticall *Theodora*, that is, to *Megera* [k], to *Alecto* and the hellish furies, who, with *Lucifer*, desired to ascend [l] into heaven, and exalt his throne above the Starres, but being loaden with the weight of his heinous crimes, fals downe into the depth, wch crimes with *Cain* [m] he having so inclosed in his breast, must needs wander up and down like a Vagabond: Vnsavory salt [n], worthy by all to bee trodden under foote, and cast into the dunghill of heresies, who had got unto him the stench [o] of heretical pravity, who bound himselfe [p] by an obligation under his owne hand, yea by his oath also, to patronize heretikes, who promised [q] to abolish the faith and Councell of *Chalcedon*. It was the just iudgement [r] of God that hee should fall from the faith, who became a Vassall to vaine glory, a schismatike [s], a Symoniacke [t], a murderer [u], whose sacriledges [x] cried

e Bar. ibid.
f *Ab ambitioso Diacono procurata.* Bar. an. 538. nu. 9.
g *Insana cupiditate flagrans ambitione Vigilius.* Ibid. nu. 5.
h *En in quod barathrum infœlicē hominem conjecit ambitio, in quantam infamiam, & infamiam adegit eū vanæ gloriæ cupido, cujus causa cogatur in ipso portu pati naufragium, & in Petra Petræ scandalum esse, et in fide infidelem haberi.* Ibid. nu. 17.
i *Se Theodoræ Augustæ instar mancipij turpissimè vendidit.* Bar. an. 540. nu. 8.
k *Accipiat (Theodora) nomen potius ab inferis, Alecto, vel Megera, vel Tisiphone nūcupanda.* Bar. an. 535. nu. 63.
l *Dum sursum ascendere meditatur, deorsum demergitur.* An. 538. nu. 18.
m *Vagetur necesse est cum Caine qui intus clausum habet, quod eum agit in adversa, peccatum.* Ibid.
n *Quid reliqui esse potuit salis insatuati, nisi ut conculcetur et projiciatur in sterquilinium haresium.* An. 538. nu. 17.
o *Putorem contraxit hæreticæ pravitatis.* Ibid.
p *Pactis conventis conscripta juraque hæreticorum defensio.* An. 540. nu. 4.
q *Augusta Vigilium sibi profiteri flagitavit, ut tolleret Synodum, lubenter suscepit Vigilius promissum ejus. Hæc cum ipse sacrilega femina volita est.* An. 536. nu. 123.
r *Ita planè sententiâ Domini judicatur à fide excidere qui gloriæ mancipium se constituit.* An. 538. nu. 17.
s *Vigilij schismatici,* an. 538. nu. 20.
t *Aliena sedis emptor.* Ibid. et *Symoniaca labes eum deturpavit.* An. 540. nu. 4.
u *Sine very necis cooperatie eum redarguit.* Ibid.
x *Clamantibus undique sacrilegijs,* an. 538. nu. 19.

unto

unto heaven, an usurper [y], a violent invader, an intruder of the *Apostolike* See, a bastard [z] and unlawfull Pope, whom the true and lawfull Pope hath bound [a] with eternall chaines, against whom hee hath shot the dart [b] of damnation, and shewed to the whole world that he ascended into the throne, *ut lapsu graviore ruat*, that hee might have a greater and more shamefull fall, that hee did not represent [c], nor was the successor of *Simon Peter*, but of *Simon Magus*, and that hee is the Vicar not of Christ, but of Antichrist, an Idol [d], even the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place, and set up in the temple of God; one rightly [e] to bee called by no other name than a Wolfe, a Thiefe, a Robber, a Pseudobishop, and even Antichrist: and, which after all the rest is especially to bee remembred as the cloze of the Cardinals Description, all this time *Vigilius* [f] both was, and was known to the Electors, to be a very sound and true Catholike. A true Catholike? Such Catholikes indeed doth the Cardinall describe and commend unto the world; a Catholike Schismatike, a Catholike heretike, a Catholike Antichrist, a Catholike Devill: If such were their Romane Catholikes and Catholike Popes in those ancient times, O gracious God, what manner of Catholike Popes are they in these ages? Then, and untill the yeare 600, was the golden age of the Church, their Romane Bishops were then like the head of *Nebuchadnezzers* Image to the late and moderne Popes, *Vigilius* a golden Bishop indeed to the brazen, iron, and clayish Popes of these later ages, the baseneſſe of which no tongue or pen can expresse; when the gold is so full of drosse, when the heads, which give life, motion, and beeing to all the rest, are so full of abomination, what manner of Catholikes thinke you are the armes, the legs, the feet and tailes of that their Babylonish Image, which all must bee proportionable? But let us returne to *Vigilius*, whom, I hope, you will now confesse to be exactly and graphically described by the pensill of their owne Apelles.

17. After his instalment, wee are to come to his Acts and gests; those, I confesse, are very few in number, they are but two. *Anastasius* a man slavishly addicted to the Papall See, was the chiefe compiler of his life, which had a man of integrity and indifferency writ, it is not unlike but many other matters had bin recorded of *Vigilius*, yet those two are very memorable, and such as most nearely touch the Pōtificall office. The former concerns the performāce of that promise which *Vigilius* made to *Theodora*, that when he were Pope he would abolish the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and restore *Anthimus*, *Severus*, and other *Eutychean* deposed Bishops: of it *Liberatus* [g] writes, that *Vigilius*, *implens promissionem suam quam Augustæ fecerat, talem scripsit Epist. fulfilling his promise wch he had made to the Empresse, writ this Epistle. Victor* B. of *Turē*, [h] sheweth also, that *Vigilius* by the means of *Antonia* the wife of *Belisarius*, writ unto *Theodosius* of *Alexandria*, *Anthimus* of *Constantinople*, and *Severus* of *Antioch*, a good while since condemned by the Apostolike See, *tanquam Catholicis, as unto Catholikes*, & signified, that himselfe was of the same opinion concerning the faith with them. The summe then of the Epistle of Pope *Vigilius* was to signifie to these heretical and deposed Bishops, that himselfe was an Eutychean, as they were,

y *Silverij vivens filius sedem usurpasse, & malis artibus nactum esse, imo & invisisse eum intelligis, an.* 540. *nu.* 4. *violentus intrusor, an.* 538. *nu.* 11.

z *Agit Rom. Pōtificem, quamvis spurium, et penitus illegitimum, an.* 538. *nu.* 21.

a *Sciens cunctos sibi subjectos, quos vel absolvat, vel aternis vinculis obligat, authoritate, &c. an.* 539. *nu.* 4.

b *Adversus Romanæ Ecclesiæ invasorem, spuriūque intrusum Pontificem, validè telum damnationis intorquet, an.* 539. *nu.* 4.

c *Silverium ostēdit universo orbi, Vigilium non referre Simonem Petrum, sed Magum, neque Vicarium Christi, sed Antichristum. Ibid.*

d *Cernebant quod ruinæ Idolum collocandū esset in Templo, conspiciendamq; abominationem desolationis stantē in loco sancto, an.* 540. *nu.* 7.

e *Quonam alio nomine quam lupus, fur et latro, Pseudoepiscopus, ac deniq; Antichristus jure potuit appellari? an* 538. *nu.* 10.

f *Cum Vigilij personam satis perspectam haberent, eum nempe esse hominem revera Catholicum, an.* 540. *nu.* 8.

g *Lib. ca.* 22.

h *Vict. in Chron.*

were, the Epiſtle it ſelfe, ſet downe both in *Liberatus* and in *Victor*, clearly teſtifieth the ſame, for therein *Vigilius* writeth thus, *eam fidem quam tenetis, Deo adjuvante, & tenuiſſe me, & tenere ſignifico, I ſignifie unto you, that, by Gods helpe, I have held, and doe now hold the ſame faith which you doe:* but the Pope adds one clauſe further for ſecreſie, wel worthy obſerving; *Oportet ut hæc quæ ſcribo nullus agnoſcat, it is needfull, that none know of theſe things which I write unto you*, but rather your wiſedome muſt have me in ſuſpition, more than any other, that ſo I may more eaſily effect, and bring to paſſe thoſe things which I have begun. See you not here, as in a glaſſe, the deep hypocriſie and hereſie of *Vigilius*? with what ſubtilty and cloſeneſſe he labours to undermine the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and the whole Catholike faith, even then when hee would ſeeme to favour it, and therefore wiſheth the Eutycheans to ſpeake of him as one who they ſuſpected moſt of all to bee againſt them. *Liberatus* adds, that *Vigilius* under his Epiſtle writ a confeſſion of his faith alſo, *in qua duas in Chriſto damnavit naturas, wherein hee condemned the teaching of two natures* in Chriſt: and diſſolving the Tome of Pope *Leo*, hee ſaid, *non duas Chriſti naturas confitemur, we doe not acknowledge two natures in Chriſt*, but one Sonne, one Chriſt, one Lord compoſed of two natures, (to wit, two before the adunation) and againe, *qui dicit in Chriſto duas formas, whoſoever ſaith that there are two formes or natures in Chriſt*, either working according to his owne property, and doth not confeſſe one perſon, one eſſence, *anathema ſit, let ſuch a man be accurſed.* Could *Arius*, *Eutyches*, or any heretike in the world more plainly condemne and accurſe the Councell of *Nice*, of *Epheſus*, of *Chalcedon*, yea, the whole Catholike Church, and Catholike faith? It is here a fine ſport to ſee how the two Cardinals, *Baronius* and *Bellarmine*, how other pettifoggers, ſuch as *Gretzer* and *Binius*, doe here beſtirre themſelves to quit *Vigilius* of this blemiſh, and of the hereſie and impiety taught in this Epiſtle. Firſt, *Vigilius* writ not this Epiſtle, it is but a counterfeit and forgery: Next, if hee did write it, yet he did it while he was an uſurper, not when hee was the true and lawfull Pope. Laſtly, hee did not hereby embrace hereſie *ex animo*, nor define it as Pope, but onely by an exteriour act hee condemned the faith. Thus they toile themſelves to waſh the Ethiopian, and turne a Blackamore into a mike white Swanne.

18. Truely, I am exceeding loath now at the ſhutting up of this Treatiſe, and after ſounding of the retreat, to enter into a new & freſh conflict, and prove *Vigilius* to have taught Eutycheaniſme, as before I have ſhewed, that hee taught the quite contrarie hereſie of Neſtorianiſme, might I not ſay, *Spectatum ſatis & donatum jam rude, tandem, Quæritis hoc iterum antiquo me includere ludo?* I have not now the like vigor of minde at the putting off of the armour, as at the firſt comming into the field; and, to ſay truth, what courage can I or any have to fight againſt a foiled enemy, which is but to cut off a dead mans head, by proving him to bee an heretike, who is not onely proved, but by moſt ample judgment and ſentence of the whole Catholike Church, already condemned for an heretike? yet becauſe I have a deſire to handle this whole argument concerning *Vigilius*, if the reader bee not

as

as much tyred as my ſelfe, after conqueſt of the generall, I will, as *Abner* did, play a little with theſe ſtragling Aſaels in this point alſo; or if you pleaſe to ſuffer me to give aime a while, I will onely μαχεῖσθαι, commit the two Cardinals into the pit to fight it out, and day the matter betwixt themſelves.

19. *Commentitium eſt, it is a forged Epiſtle*, ſaith Cardinall [k] *Baronius*, it is none of *Vigilius* writing. I here one ſay ſo, ſaith Cardinall *Bellarmine* [l], but I ſay, *Vigilium ſcripſiſſe illam Epiſtolam, & damnaſſe Catholicam fidem, that Vigilius did write that Epiſtle, and condemne the Catholike faith, Epiſtolam quidem ſcripſit nefariam, truely he writ* [m] *that nefarious Epiſtle*, unworthy of any Chriſtian. Here is worke indeed, ſaying againſt ſaying, Cardinall againſt Cardinall, and whether Cardinall is the ſtronger let the ſpectators conſider: But the beſt ſport is, that whereas Cardinall *Baronius* [n] tels us, that this Epiſtle was written by ſome unskilfull Eutychean heretike, and Cardinall [o] *Bellarmine* tels us, that it was writ by *Vigilius*, it followeth upon the two Cardinals ſayings joyned together, that *Vigilius* was both an heretike, and an unskilfull Eutychean heretike.

k Bar. an. 538. nu. 15.

l Bell. lib. 4. de Pont. ca. 10.

m Bell. ca. eod.

n *Nomine Vigily ab aliquo Eutychiano eſſe ſuppoſitam, eoque imperito, ex pluribus colligi poteſt.* Bar. an. 538 nu. 19.

20. From their words let us come to their ſtrokes and ſad blowes, *Cauſa cum cauſa, ratio cum ratione pugnet*. Cardinall *Bellarmine* hath but one reaſon, but that is indeed a very ſound one, like the Cat in the fable, which hath but one ſhift againſt the hounds; his reaſon [p] is the teſtimony of Saint [q] *Liberatus* who then lived, who not onely teſtifieth *Vigilius* to have writ this, but ſets downe the very Epiſtle it ſelfe of *Vigilius*; and whereas ſome pretended both that *Liberatus* was corrupted by heretikes, and that his narration was contrary to their Pontificall; the Card. tels us for a certainty, that there [r] is neither any footſtep nor print of corruption in *Liberatus*, neither doth he [ſ] herein diſſent from the Pontificall. Cardinall *Baronius* boaſteth [t] of his reaſon, as the Fox did in the ſame fable, that he had a number of ſleights and ſhifts to deceive the dogs; but the hounds comming ſuddenly upon them both, the Cat skipt into a tree, which was her onely pollicy, and there ſhee ſaw the Fox with all his hundreth wiles torne in pieces: even ſuch are Cardinall *Baronius* his ſleights in this cauſe, hee hath many, but never a one that is worth a Ruſh, none that would ſave from tearing if the hounds ſhould happen to come upon him. His firſt is, becauſe the [u] Acts of the ſixt generall Councell doe ſhew, that heretikes had counterfaited ſome Epiſtles in the name of *Vigilius*, and particularly thoſe bookes, which are ſaid to be writ from *Vigilius* to *Iuſtinian* and *Theodora* of bleſſed memory. Thus ſay the Acts; To which the Card. aſſumes, *ſane quidem inſcriptio recitatæ Epiſtolæ; Truly the inſcription of the Epiſt. recited in the name of Vigilius, ad Dominos, to my Lords*, doth demonſtrate that it was written to *Iuſt.* and *Theodora*. Alas that this muſt be one of the Cardinals ſhifts, and that it muſt bee for the worth of it ſtiled [x] a demonſtration: Why, there needs here, neither maſtive nor hound, any beagle or brache will rent this reaſon into 20. pieces. Firſt, what meant the Cardinal to expreſſe the words of the ſixt Councell, where *Theodora* is called an Empreſſe of bleſſed memory? had he forgot what in another place [y] hee ſaid, *that ſhe died miſerably*;

o Bell. loc. cit.

p Bell. loc. cit.

q Breviarium collectum à ſancto Liberato, ſic inſcribitur apud Binium, to. 2. pa. 610.

r *Veſtigium nullum apparet corruptionis in libro Liberati.* Bell.

ſ *Revera non pugnat narratio Liberati, cum narratione Pontificalis.* Ibid.

t *Plura ſunt quæ perſuadent.* Bar. an. 538. nu. 15. *et ex pluribus colligi poteſt.* An. eod. nu. 19.

u Bar. an. 538. nu. 19.

x *Inſcriptio ad Dominos, demonſtrat hanc Epiſtolam ſcriptam eſſe ad Juſt. et Theodoram.* Bar. ibid.

y Bar. an. 548. nu. 24.

miserably, being blasted by the Popes thunder-clap? Againe what a demonstration is this; some Epistles were forged in the name of *Vigilius*, *ergo*, this is forged. *A pari*, some bookes are forged, the Cardinals Annals are some bookes, *ergo*, they are all forged; or some man is as wise as *Chorebus*, *ergo*, so is the Cardinall. Take heed, I pray you, the hounds sent not these consequences of the Cardinall, grounded on that old maxime, *A particulari non est Syllogisari*. Further yet, what a reason call you this; some bookes sent in *Vigilius* name to *Iustinian* and *Theodora*, were forged, *ergo*, this Epist. is forged. It is a demonstration, *à baculo ad Angulum*, for this Epistle was writ neither to *Iustinian*, nor to *Theodora*, but to *Anthimus*, *Theodosius* and *Severus*; The Cardinall may know this clearly by *Victor*, who testifieth the same in expresse words; he might have perceived it by *Liberatus*, who saith, that *Vigilius* writ this Epistle to heretikes; whereas not Pope *Leo* himselfe was more orthodoxall in this point than *Iustinian*, as besides infinite other proofes, is evident both by his Epistle [z] to *Mennas*, confirming the deposition of *Anthimus*, and by that his Epistle [a] written to *Epiphanius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, foure [b] years before *Silverius* was expelled, wherein hee professeth to embrace all the foure Councels, and hee anathematizeth all that are anathematized by any of them, declaring that he will not permit within his Empire any that oppugned those Councels. But for all this the Card. will prove by the Inscription [c] of this Epistle, that it written to *Iustinian* and *Theodora*. What if it were? can hee prove withall that no other Epistle or booke was writ to them in the name of *Vigilius*? No, hee never offers to prove that, and till that bee proved his reason at the best is but *à particulari*, some Epistle writ in the name of *Vigilius* to *Iustinian* and *Theodora* was forged, *ergo*, this; some man deserves a whetstone, *ergo*, so doth the Cardinall. Besides this inconsequence, the Antecedent is so false that I am ashamed to take the renowned Cardinall so tripping in his demonstration: The Inscription, saith hee, demonstrates that it was writ to *Iustinian* and *Theodora*. Truly the Inscription demonstrates the Cardinall to be of no truth or credit at al. The Inscription in *Liberatus* (and him the [d] Cardinal followeth) is *Dominis & Christis* [e] *Vigilius*, *Vigilius to my Lords and Christs*. An Inscription indeed with a witnesse, and a lesson for the Cardinall; *Iustinian* Christ, *Theodora* Christ, and yet the Cardinall rankes the one Christ among the Furies of hell, the other Christ hee condemnes to the pit and torments of hell; what a Cardinall to bee so malitious and spightfull against Christ, and Christs?

21 The Inscription, saith the Cardinall, points [f] at *Iustinian* and *Theodora*: I rejoyce to see the Cardinall once so charitably affected, as to thinke *Iustinian* to be Christ, *Theodora* Christ, let all applaud the Cardinall in this saying; seldome shall you take him, nor will hee long persist in so good a mood or minde. The Inscription of the Epistle is to Christs, the Inscription demonstrates and points at them, as the Cardinall tels us; Christs then they were, Christs they are against the spite of all slandering tongues, Christs let them bee, and with Christ let them rest for ever. But will you now see a fine sleight indeed

[z] *Constitutio Iustiniani vocatur. Extat autem post finem Conc. Constantinopolitani sub Menna. to. 2. pa. 469.*
[a] *Epistola illa ad Epiphanium extat. Leg. 7. Cod. de summa Trin.*
[b] *Data est ea Epist. Iust. 3. Consul. Is est an. 533.*
[c] *Sanc quidem Inscriptio demonstrat. Bar. an. 538. nu. 19.*
[d] *Bar. an. 538. nu. 13.*
[e] *Sic habetur in Lib. ca. 22. apud Bin. pa. 624. b.*
[f] *Demonstrat.*

deed of the Cardinall, ſuch as put downe the Fox, and Cat, and all. Truely, ſaith hee, the Inſcription, *ad Dominos*, demonſtrates, that this Epiſtle was writ to *Iuſtinian* and *Theodora*: why, what meanes this Inſcription, *ad Dominos?* why doth the Cardinal clip away the one halfe of the Inſcription? The Inſcription in *Liberatus* is, *Dominis & Chriſtis*; the Cardinall belike miſdoubted by *Chriſtis* could not bee demonſtrated *Iuſtinian* and *Theodora*, *Chriſtus* is the Popes prerogative, it demonſtrates him, and therefore leſt the Pope ſhould frowne upon the Cardinall for ſaying this Inſcription, *Dominis ac Chriſtis*, doe demonſtrate *Iuſtinian* and *Theodora*, hee corrupts the Text, and maimes the Inſcription, and makes it to bee but *ad Dominos*, and ſo the Inſcription, *ad Dominos*, may well point at the Emperour and Empreſſe.

22. Yet take the Cardinals maimed Inſcription as it is, doth this title, *ad Dominos*, demonſtrate the Emperour? may not one write *Domino*, or *ad Dominum*, but onely to the Emperour? how many thouſand millions of Emperors will the Cardinall coine unto us? every ſervant, every prentiſe may write, *Domino*, or *Dominis*, unto their Maſter, and then by the Cardinals demonſtration you ſhall have Coblers, and Tailors, and Weavers, and all Artificers in the world turned into Emp. and their wifes into Empreſſes, for, *ſanè quidem*, verily this Inſcriptiõ, *ad Dominos*, demonſtrates that the Epiſt. is writ to the Emperour and Empreſſe. Doe you think, I ſay not, that Philoſophers and Logicians, but any elementary boy that hath learned to decline *Dominus* can hold himſelfe at the hearing of ſuch demonſtrations? But to put the matter out of all doubt, and demonſtrate the other demonſtration to bee as idle a fancie as can deviſed, the Inſcription which is but in briefe ſet downe by *Liberatus*, is fully and at large expreſſed by *Victor*, who lived and writ alſo at that time: *The tenour* (ſaith hee [g]) *of Vigilius Epiſtle is proved to bee thus, Biſhop Vigilius, Dominis ac fratribus, to Theodoſius, Anthimus and Severus Biſhops, my Lords and brethren, joyned to us in the love of Chriſt our Saviour:* What is now become of the Demonſtration, *ad Dominos*? how doth the Inſcription, *ad Dominos, ſanè quidem*, truly and verily demonſtrate *Iuſtinian* and *Theodora*, when, together with *Dominus*, is expreſly ſet downe and named who thoſe *Domini* were, to whom *Vigilius* writ, even three depoſed hereticall Biſhops?

[g] *Vict. Tun. in Chron. ſub an. 2. poſt Conſ. Baſily.*

23. The Cardinall, and *Binius* [h] following him, will not yet let goe this demonſtration, but much pleaſe themſelves in a new device; The Epiſtle, ſaith hee [i], is inſcribed alſo *ad Patres*, now it is unuſuall for Popes to call Emperours their Fathers, and therefore ſure it is but a counterfeit Epiſtle in *Vigilius* name: Why, but if Popes doe not uſe that terme, it is their owne fault, thy might juſtly ſo call Emperours, Emperours are the fathers of their whole Empire, and that in a more eminent manner than any other father, Imperiall Fathers, commanding and compelling fathers, fathers ſuperiour to all other fathers, even to all Pontificall fathers; but where, I pray you, is that Inſcription *Dominis ac Patribus*? Not in *Victor*, not in *Liberatus*, at leaſt not in the beſt Edition of him, not in that which *Binius* hath ſet forth, there the Inſcription is faire, and cleare, *Dominis ac Chriſtis*; and yet ſo ridiculous

[h] *Bin. in not. ad Liberatum. § In hiſtoria.*

[i] *Bar. an. 538. nu. 19. Abhorret à conſueto ſcribendi more, &c. et, quodnam unquam extitit prædeceſſorum exemplum, ut Imperatores Romanus Pontifex Patres nominaret.*

lous was *Binius*, and so foolishly addicted to *Baronius*, that he proves this Epistle to bee forged, because the Inscription is, *Dominis ac Patribus*, whereas himselfe in the leafe before had set downe the Inscription to bee *Dominis ac Christis*, let it bee *Patribus*: the Cardinall and *Binius* surely doated when they concluded, that the Epistle was writ to the Emperour, for as out of *Liberatus*, but most clearely out of *Victors* words is demonstrated, it was writ to father *Anthimus*, father *Theodosius*, and father *Severus*: *Vigilius* might well call them *Patres*, when in the Inscription he called them Bishops [k].

k *Dominis Theodosio, Anthimo et Severo Episcopis. Apud Victorem loc. cit.*

24. And certainly *Baronius* was conscious to himselfe, that this Epistle was writ to Bishops, not to the Emperour and Empresse; for as misdoubting that this would, and justly might bee replied to his demonstration, hee adds [l], *Si dicas scriptum ad Episcopos, if you say the Epistle was written to Bishops*, and not to the Emperour, yet even so it is a forgery also, and why? for, *Qui novus iste mos est, what a novelty is it*, and utterly unusuall, that the Pope should call his fellow Bishops, *Patres & Dominos*? or if you say that it should be read *fratribus*, and not *Patribus*, yet certainly that *procul abhorret, is very abhorrent*, that he should call the same both brethren and Lords. What is the demonstration come now to relye upon this, It is new, It is unusuall; as if nothing that is new or unusuall were done or writ: It was new and unusual to thrust out and murther the true Pope, yet *Vigilius* did it for all the novelty thereof. Could *Vigilius* act a matter so horrible being new and unusuall, and might not hee write a phrase, or give a title being new and unusuall? It is unusuall, I trow, for Popes to call heretical Bishops, deposed by generall Councels, their brethren beloved in Christ, he that would honour deposed heretikes with such loving termes, would hee doubt to call them by an unusuall title, *Dominos ac Patres*, or, *Dominos ac Fratres*? and yet neither of both is so unusuall as the Cardinall would have it thought. In the Councell at *Barre* [m], when the Greekes disputed against Pope *Vrbane* so eagerly against the procession of the holy Ghost, that the Pope was at a *non plus*, and unable to answer, being driven to that exigent, and remembring that Anselme Archbishop of *Canterbury* was in the Councell, *exclamat he cried aloud* before the whole Councell, *Pater et Magister Anselme ubi es? Oh my father and Master Anselme where are you?* come now and defend your mother the Church. And when after much crying and shouting, they brought him in presence among them, Pope *Vrbane* said, *includamus hunc in orbe nostro quasi alterius orbis Papam; let us inclose him in our circle, as the Pope of the other world.* Might not *Vigilius* do that to three Patriarks, which *Vrbane* did to an Archbishop? might not *Vigilius* call them fathers, as well as *Vrbane* called *Anselme* father and Master? Might not that bee done secretly, and in a private letter which the Pope did openly in the audience of the whole Councell? Is it more incongruity for the Pope to call the Patriarcke of *Alexandria*, or of *Antioch*, his father or Lord, than to call the Patriarke of England, father, master, yea, Pope in his owne Patriarchal Diocesse in England?

l *Bar. loc. cit.*

m *Guil. Malsbur. lib. 1. de gest. Pontif. Anglor. 127.*

25. But the Cardinall still harps on a wrong string; *Vigilius* neither

ther in the Inſcription, ſubſcription, nor body of the Epiſtle, called them fathers, but brethren: That title is given them indeed three or foure times, both in *Liberatus* and in *Victor*, *fraternitati veſtræ*, *fraternitatem veſtram*, *& orate pro nobis mihi fratres in Chriſto conjuncti*; *pray for us my brethren in the Lord.* Which evidently ſhewes, that *Baronius* and *Binius* either themſelves corrupted, and followed ſome corrupt Edition of that Epiſtle, when they ſo craftily perſiſt on the Inſcription, *Dominis ac Patribus*; for had hee ſtiled them in the title fathers, hee would not in the Epiſtle have ſo often called them brethren, and never once fathers. Now to ſay as the Cardinall [n] doth, that it is abhorrent either from reaſon or practice to call the ſame parties both *Dominos* and *fratres*, argues, either extreme and ſupine negligence, or obſtinate perverſneſſe in the Cardinall and *Binius*, ſcarce any thing in antiquity being more frequent. Pope *Damaſus* [o] writ a Synodall letter to *Proſper* Biſhop of *Numidia*, and others, he inſcribes it thus, *Dominis venerabilibus & fratribus Proſpero, Leoni, Reparato, Damaſus Epiſcopus*; *Biſhop Damaſus to my reverend Lords and Brethren Proſper, &c.* So the Councell of *Carthage* [p] in two letters, written the one to Pope *Boniface*, the other to Pope *Cæleſtine*, writes in both in this manner, *To our Lord and honourable brother*: So *Cyrill* [q] Patriarke of *Alexandria* writ to *Aurelius Valentinus*, and the other African Biſhops, *Dominis honorabilibus*, *to the honourable Lords*, and holy brethren. In like ſort *Atticus* [r] Patriarke of *Conſtantinople* to the ſame Africane Biſhops, *Dominis ſanctis*, *to the holy Lords*, & our moſt bleſſed brethren, fellow Biſh. Why might not *Vigilius* call other Patriarks Lords and brethren, when *Atticus*, *Cyrill*, the Councell of *Carthage*, yea, Pope *Damaſus* himſelfe called other Biſhops, *Dominos ac fratres*. Nay, ſeeing the Pope is uſed to inſcribe his letters to the Emp. *Dominis ac* [s] *filijs*, or, *Domino ac filio*, as doth P. *Hadriã* to *Conſtant.* and *Irene*, & to *Charles* [t], why may not he as well call his brother as his ſon, Lord? is the title of ſon more compatible with *Dominis*, than the title of brother? or whether title, thinke you, Lord or brother, may not the Pope give to his fellow Biſhops? the name of brother is almoſt every where ſeene in his letters, the Cardinall envies not that unto them; it is the name of *Dominus* that ſeemes ſomewhat harſh. The Cardinall would not have the Pope call or account other Biſhops his Lords; and yet how can they, even the meaneſt of them, but bee his Lord, when hee gladly ſtiles himſelfe their ſervant, yea, ſervant [u] to every ſervant of the Lord? So that if the Popes Secretary were well catechized, and knew good manners, his Holines ſhould write thus to his own ſervants, To my Lord Groome of my ſtable, to my Lord the Scull of my Kitchen, I am indeed your ſervant, I am *ſervus ſervorum Dei*: But let the title of the Epiſtle bee howſoever yee will, whether, *Dominis ac Chriſtis*, as it is in *Liberatus*; or, *Dominis & fratribus*, as it is in *Victor*; or, *Dominis & Patribus*, as the Cardinall (without any authority that I can finde) would have it, certaine it is, that the parties to whom *Vigilius* writ it, were the three depoſed Biſhops to whom *Vigilius* was like to give any of all thoſe titles, and not to the Emperour and Empreſſe, as the Cardinall without all ſhadow of truth, affirmeth, and ſaith that he hath demonſtrated

n *Vel ſi fratres legas, certè procul abhorret, ut eoſdem dicat & Dominos. Bar. an. 538. nu. 19.*

o *Epiſt. S. Damaſi apud. Bin. to. 1. Conc. pa. 501.*

p *Habentur in Concil. Africana ſub Cæleſt. et Boniſ. ca. 101. et 105. to. 1. Conc. pa. 644. & 645.*

q *In eodem Cõc: Afric. ca. 102.*

r *In eodem Conc. ca. 103.*

s *Sic Adrianus ſcribit ad. Conſtantinum et Irenem. Tom. 3. Conc. pa. 254.*

t *Adrianus Papa 10. eod. pa. 263.*

u *Servus ſervorum Dei, ſic ſe ſcribit Gregor. 7. qui prius Hildebrandus dictus eſt. Epiſt. 13, 14. et reliquis plus centies.*

the ſame, but it is with ſuch a demonſtration as was never found in any but in *Chorebus* his Analyticks.

26. Another of the Cardinals reaſons to prove this Epiſtle to be a forgery, is taken from a repugnance and contrariety of the words in the Subſcription, wherein *Vigilius* [x] firſt profeſſeth to hold but one nature in Chriſt, and then anathematizeth *Dioſcorus*, who held the ſame. The Cardinall ſhould have proved, that *Vigilius* could not, or did not write contrarieties. As the Cardinall, though he hath beene ſo often taken tardy in contradictions, yet will not deny the Annals for that cauſe to bee his owne faire birth; ſo hee might thinke of this writing, though it bee repugnant to it ſelfe, yet it might proceed from ſuch an unſtayed and unſtable minde, as *Vigilius* had: But I doe acquit *Vigilius* from this contradiction, it is not his, hee condemned not *Dioſcorus* in his Subſcription. In his Epiſtle he profeſſeth to hold the ſame doctrine of one onely nature in Chriſt with *Eutyches* and *Dioſcorus*; there is little reaſon then to thinke, that hee did in his Subſcription adjoyned, condemne the profeſſors of that doctrine, of which *Dioſcorus* was one of the chiefe, as deepe in that hereſie as *Eutyches* himſelfe: What ſhall wee ſay then to *Liberatus*, in whom *Dioſcorus* is named? Truely had not malice and ſpight ſhut the eyes of *Baronius* and *Binius*, they could not but have ſeene, that the name of *Dioſcorus* is by the overſight or negligence of the writer, inſerted in ſtead of *Neſtorius*: It was *Neſtorius* and not *Dioſcorus* whom *Vigilius* there accurſed, the very concluſion and coherence, not onely with the Epiſtle, but with the next precedent words in the Subſcription, doe evidently demonſtrate thus much; for having profeſſed in his Epiſtle [y] to hold, as did *Dioſcorus*, but one nature in Chriſt, having againe in his Subſcription and next words before, anathematized [z] all who admit two, or deny but one nature in Chriſt, hee in particular declares who thoſe are, that hee therein anathematized, ſaying, *Anathematizamus ergo*, therefore we accurſe (by this our condemnation of thoſe who deny but one nature) *Paulus Samoſatenus*, *Neſtorius*, *Theodorus*, and *Theodoret*, and all who have or doe embrace their doctrine. Now it was *Neſtorius*, not *Dioſcorus*, who embraced the ſame doctrine with *Paulus Samoſatenus*, with *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia*, and *Theodoret*, all theſe concurred in that one and ſelfe-ſame hereſie of denying one nature in Chriſt, they all conſented in teaching two natures, making two perſons in Chriſt, which *Dioſcorus* and *Eutyches* condemned. Of *Theodorus* and *Theodoret* it is cleare by the Councels, both of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*, and the fift Synod. Of *Paulus Samoſatenus*, the writing or conteſtation of the Catholike Clergy of *Conſtantinople*, ſet downe in the Acts of *Epheſus* [a], doe certainly witneſſe and declare the ſame; the title of which is to ſhew, partly, *Neſtoriũ ejuſdem eſſe ſententia cum Paulo Samoſateno, that Neſtorius is of the ſame opinion with Paulus Samoſatenus*; and in the conteſtation it ſelfe it is ſaid thus, *I adjure all to publiſh this our writing for the evident reproofe of Neſtorius the heretike, as one who is convinced to teach and openly maintain, eadem prorſus quæ Paulus Samoſatenus, the ſame doctrines altogether which Paulus Samoſatenus did*; and then they expreſſe ſeven heretical aſſertions taught alike by them both.

x Quo pallo, rogo, potuit Vigilius anathematizare Dioſcorum, ſi cum Dioſcoro Eutychianam hæreſin prædicat? Hæc enim ſibi invicem adverſantur, ut utraque vera eſſe non poſſint. Bar. an. 538. nu. 16. et idem habet Bin. not. in Lib. pa. 626. a.

y Eam fidem quam tenetis, & tenere me, et tenuiſſe ſignifico. Epiſt. Vigily tũ apud Liber. ca. 22. et Vict. Tam. in Chron. an. poſt Conſ. Baſily 2.

z Qui dicit in Chriſto duas formas, et non cõfitetur unam perſonam, unam eſſentiam, anathema ſit. Ibid. apud Liber.

a To. 1. act. Conc. Eph. ca. 11.

both. Seeing then *Vigilius* accurſed him who taught the ſame with *Paulus*, *Theodorus*, and *Theodoret*, and that was *Neſtorius*, not *Dioſcorus*: it is undoubtedly certaine, that not *Dioſcorus*, but *Neſtorius* was the party written and named by *Vigilius* in his ſubſcription: and that *Dioſcorus* was not by *Vigilius*, but by the overſight and negligence of the exſcriber of *Liberatus*, wrongfully inſerted in ſtead of *Neſtorius*. And truly the like miſtakings are not unuſuall in *Liberatus*. In this very Chapter it is ſayd that *Vigilius* a little after the death of *Agapetus*, and election of *Silverius*, when he came from *Conſtantinople* to *Rome* with the Empreſſe her letters for placing him in the Romane See, he found [b] *Belliſarius* at *Ravenna*; a manifeſt miſtaking of *Ravenna* for *Naples*; for there, and not at *Ravenna* was *Belliſarius* at that time, as by *Procopius* [c] is evident: and becauſe this is no way prejudiciall to their cauſe, *Baronius* and *Binius* can there willingly admit [d] an error or ſlip of memory in *Liberatus*, and not ſo haſtily conclude as here they doe, that becauſe *Belliſarius* was not then at *Ravenna*, as in *Liberatus* is falſly affirmed; therefore that Chapter of *Liberatus* is forged, and not truly written by him. Would his Cardinalſhip have beene as favourable to *Liberatus* in naming *Dioſcorus* for *Neſtorius*, which the like evidence of truth and all the circumſtances doe neceſſarily enforce, the Epiſtle might as well paſſe for the true writing of *Vigilius*, as that Chapter for the writing of *Liberatus*. In this very Epiſtle of *Vigilius*, it is ſaid in *Liberatus* [e], I know, *quia ad Sanctitatẽ veſtrã fidei meæ crudelitas pervenit*, that the cruelty of my faith is before this come to your eares; and the very ſame word of *crudelitas fidei* is in *Victor* alſo, wch argues the fault to be very ancient. It is true that the faith of *Vigilius* was indeed cruell, for he by it cruelly condemned, aboliſhed, and as it were murdered the Councell of *Chalcedon*, that is in truth, the whole Catholike faith: and ſo this happened to be not onely a true, but a fit and ſignificant error. Yet the Cardinall was ſo friendly and charitable here, as to thinke that it was but a ſlip of the penne, or negligence of the writer, in ſaying *crudelitas*, for *credulitas*, as the Cardinall readeth [f] it; might not by the like negligence, and with leſſe diſgrace to *Vigilius*, *Dioſcorus* ſlip into the text in ſtead of *Neſtorius*? In the inſcription of the Epiſtle *Liberatus* reades it, *Dominis ac Chriſtis*; *Victor*, *Dominis ac fratribus*; the Cardinall corrects both, and makes it worſt of all, *Dominis ac patribus*. May he play the Criticke, and turne *Chriſtis*, or *fratribus*, into *patribus*, and that without, nay againſt reaſon, and may not others in the ſubſcription reſtore *Neſtorius* for *Dioſcorus*, when the truth and neceſſary circumſtances enforce that correction? It was *Neſtorius* then not *Dioſcorus* whom *Vigilius* accurſed; it is but the errour or corrupt writing of *Vigilius* Epiſtle in *Liberatus*, (which wee alſo condemne) and not the Epiſtle of *Vigilius* at which the Cardinall unjuſtly quarrelleth.

b *Quin & Ravennæ reperit Belliſarium. Liber. ca. 22.*

c *Nam Silverius ait ejectum à Belliſario. p. 287 id fuit anno 3. belli Gothici, ut liquet ex pa. 313 ubi ait, Tertius belli hujus annus exibat, at Belliſarius non cepit Ravennam ante finem anni 5. ejus belli, ut ait Proc. 340. & 342. ubi ait, Iam annus 5. exibat.*

d *Hic puto Liberatum memoria lapſum, Ravennam pro Neapoli poſuiſſe. Bar. an. 538. nu. 7. & idem Bin. Not. in Liber.*

e *Apud Bin. to. 2. pa. 614.*

f *Bar. an 538. nu. 14.*

27. His third and laſt ſhift is worſt of all. If *Vigilius* had indeed writ this Epiſtle, *why then* (ſaith he [g]) *was it not upbraided unto him at Conſtantinople, neither by the Empreſſe Theodora, when ſhee contended with him, about the reſtoring of Anthimus, nor by Theodorus Biſhop of Cæſarea, and Mennas, when Vigilius excommunicated them both, and they*

g *Bar. an. 538. nu. 15.*

vexed him ſo long; nor by the Emperour Iuſtinian, when he was furiouſly inraged againſt him; nor by the fift Synod, which was offended with him for refuſing to come to the Councell; nor yet by Facundus, when he writ angerly againſt him? theſe were publikely debated, *nec tamen de dicta epiſtolâ, vel uſquam mentio; yet is there not any mention, or light ſignification of any ſuch Epiſtle.* Thus the Cardinall. Of whom I againe demand where he learned to diſpute *ab authoritate humanâ negativè*; the old and good rule was, *Neque ex negativis rectè concludere ſi vis*; but the Cardinall hath new Analytickes, and new-found rules of Art, *Ex negativis poteris concludere ſi vis.* Himſelfe witneſſeth [h] and proclameth *Vigilius* to have beene a Symoniack, and to have compacted with *Belliſarius* for 200. peeces of gold, to have beene excommunicated, depoſed, degraded, by Pope *Silverius* pronouncing that ſentence out of his *Apoſtolike* authority, and from the mouth of God: why was not this Symony, why was not this cenſure of *Silverius* upbraided, neither by *Theodora*, nor *Theodorus*, nor *Iuſtinian*, nor the fift Councell, nor *Facundus*? that being a publike and knowne cenſure, had been a matter of farre greater diſgrace to *Vigilius*, farre more juſtifiable than the epiſtle writ privately and ſecretly to *Anthimus*, and commanded by *Vigilius* to bee kept cloſe that none might know it. See you not how vaine this ſhift of the Cardinall is? How it croſſeth him in his Annals, to ſlander *Vigilius* as ſymoniacall, as cenſured by *Silverius*, both which ſeeing they are not upbrayded to him by the forenamed perſons, but ſet downe in the Cardinals Analytickes, ſure they are impoſtures, and forgeries. What though none of them upbrayded this Epiſtle unto him? Is it not enough that it is aſſuredly teſtified and recorded by S. *Liberatus*; by Biſhop *Victor*, two who lived and writ at that ſame time? what if moſt of them knew not of this Epiſtle, which was ſent ſecretly by *Vigilius*, and by his advice kept cloſely by *Anthimus* and *Severus*? what if they all knew it, and yet having other crimes enough to object, thought it needleſſe to mention that, as it ſeemes they did the Symony of *Vigilius*, and cenſure of *Silverius*? what if they were not ſo ſpitefull as the Cardinall is, and therefore would not ſay the worſt they could againſt his Holineſſe?

h Bar. loc. iuſ. pr. citat.

28. But ſee the ſtrange dealing of the Cardinall! How or why ſhould *Theodora* upbrayd this to *Vigilius* for the not reſtoring of *Anthimus*? that quarrell for the reſtoring of *Anthimus* (as I have often ſayd, and clearly proved) was a meere deviſe and fiction of *Anaſtaſius*, it was nothing but *Alcibiades* dogs tayle. Or how ſhould *Iuſtinian* upbraid it, when he was ſo enraged againſt *Vigilius*, and perſecuted him for not reſtoring *Anthimus*? Seeing neither *Iuſtinian* perſecuted *Vigilius*, nor was enraged againſt him, but for the ſpace of five of ſix yeares they both ſang one note, they fully conſorted together? or how ſhould *Mennas* and *Theodorus* upbraid it, when they were excommunicated by *Vigilius*? Seeing that excommunication, & all the circumſtances of it are merely fictitious, as by the death of *Mennas*, (which was long before that forged excommunication of him) was demonſtrated? Are not theſe worthy reaſons to diſprove this Epiſtle to bee writ by *Vigilius*, which all relie on fictions, & on moſt untrue and idle fancies? And whether

whether *Facundus* upbraided it or no, may bee queſtioned, nor will it bee clearly knowne, untill they will ſuffer *Facundus* to come out of their *Vaticane*, where hee lyeth yet impriſoned. But as for the fift Councell, it was great ſillineſſe in the Cardinall, once to thinke that they ſhould or would upbraid this Epiſtle to him, they uſed the Pope in the moſt honourable and reſpectfull manner that could be wiſhed, they uttered no one harſh or hard word againſt him, but what was rightly ſaid or done by him, as his condemning of *Origen*, his condemning the *Three Chapters* before the time of the Councell, that they often mention and approve it alſo. They ſought by lenity to win the Popes heart to conſent unto the truth, which they defended: ſeeing they could not prevaile with him, yet they would have the whole world to teſtifie, together with the Popes peeviſhneſſe, their owne lenity, equity and moderation uſed towards him, and that it was not hatred or contempt of his perſon, nor any precedent occaſion, but only the truth and equity of that preſent cauſe, which enforced them to involve him (remaining obdurate in his hereſie) in that *Anathema* which they in generall denounced againſt all the pertinacious defenders of the *Three Chapters*, of which *Vigilius* was the chiefe, and ſtandard-bearer to the reſt. Did the Cardinall thinke with ſuch poore ſleights to quit *Vigilius* of this Epiſtle? If nothing elſe, truely the very imbecillity and dulneſſe of the Cardinals reaſons and demonſtrations in this point may perſwade, that *Vigilius* and none but he was the author of it. *Baronius* was too unadviſed without better weapons to enter into the ſand, with old Cardinall *Bellarmine* in this cauſe, who is knowne to bee, *plurimarum palmarum vetus ac nobilis gladiator*, and in this combate with *Baronius* hee hath played the right *Eutellus* indeed. Come, let us give to him in token of his conqueſt, *corollam & palmam*, and let *Baronius* in remembrance of his foile, leave this Epiſtle to *Vigilius*, with this Impreſſe,

Vigilio ſcriptum hoc, Eutello palma feratur.

29. *Vigilius* now, by juſt Duell, is proved to bee the true author of this Epiſtle: Be it ſo, ſay they [k], yet that is no prejudice at all to the *Apoſtolike* See, becauſe he writ it in the time of *Sylverius*, while as yet *Vigilius* was not the lawfull Pope, but an intruder and uſurper, and Pſeudopope, and herein they all joyne hand in hand, *Bellarmine* with *Baronius*, *Gretzer* and *Binius* with them both. But feare not the tailes of theſe ſmoaking firebrands, nor the wrath of *Rheſin*, *Aram*, and *Remalius* ſonne, becauſe they have taken wicked counſell againſt the truth. Nor needed there here any long contention about this matter, for how doe they prove this ſaying of theirs, that *Vigilius* writ it whē *Sylverius* lived, and not afterwards. Truly by no other but the Colliers argument, It is ſo, becauſe it is ſo, proofe they have none at all, they were ſo deſtitute of reaſons in this point, that laying this for their foundation to excuſe the Pope for teaching hereſie, they begge this, or rather take it without begging or asking, by vertue of that place called, *Petitio Principij*. Let us pardon *Binius* and *Gretzer*, who gathered up onely the ſcraps under the Cardinals tables, but for a Cardinal ſo baſely and beggarly to behave himſelfe, as to diſpute from ſuch ſophiſticall

[k] *Etiamſi iſta verè ſcripſiſſet Vigilius, nullum tamen ob id infertur præjudicium Apoſtolicæ ſedi, cujus tunc ipſe erat invaſor, Silverius autem germanus Pontifex. Bar. an. 538. nu. 15. Fecit id cum adhuc viveret Silverius, quo tempore Vigilius non erat Papa, ſed Pſeudopapa. Bell. lib. 4. de Pont. ca. 10. Non mirum ſi Pſeudoepiſcopus et quaſi Antichriſtus ad ſchiſma, hereſin addidiſſet. Bin. not. in. Lib. pa. 826. a. ita etiam Gretz. in Defenſ. ca. 10. lib. 4. Bell.*

phiſtical topicks, is too foule a ſhame and blemiſh to his wit and learning. And why may not wee take upon us the like Magiſteriall authority, and to their, I ſay it is ſo, oppoſe, I ſay it is not ſo? Doe they thinke by their bigge lookes, and *ſeſquipedalia verba*, to downface the truth?

30. But becauſe I have no fancy to this Pythagoricall kinde of learning, there are one or two reaſons which declare, that *Vigilius* writ this Epiſtle after the death of *Silverius*, when he was the onely and true lawfull Pope; for the former is the narration of *Liberatus*, who in a continued ſtory of theſe matters, after the death of *Silverius* relates how *Vigilius* writ this; *Silverius*, ſaith he [l], *dyed with famine*; *Vigilius autem implens promiſſum*, And *Vigilius* to fulfill his promiſe, writ this Epiſtle. Oh, ſaith *Gretzer* [m], *Liberatus* uſeth here an anticipation, and ſets downe that before which fell out after. Prove that *Gretzer*; Prove it? why, his proofe is like his Maſters, It is ſo, becauſe it is ſo: Other proofe you ſhall have none of *Gretzer*: He thought, belike, his words ſhould paſſe for currant pay, as well as a Cardinals, but it was too fooliſh preſumption in him to take upon him to diſpute ſo *Cardinaliter*; that is, without reaſon; why ſhould it not be thought, ſeeing we find nothing to the contrary, that *Liber.* in his narration followed the order and ſequell of things and times, as the law of an hiſtorian requires, rather than beleeve *Gretzers* bare ſaying, that it is diſorderly and contrary to the order of the times and event of things?

l *Liber. ca. 22.*

m *Gret. loc. cit.*

31. This will further appeare by the other reaſon drawne from the time when this Epiſtle was written: *Baronius* referres it to the yeare 538. wherein *Silverius* was expelled, and ſaith [n], that though *Vigilius* had truly writ it, yet it is no prejudice to the *Apoſtolike* See, *cujus tunc ipſe invaſor*, of which hee was an invader and intruder at that time when it was written. But the Cardinal is miſtaken in this point, for it is cleare and certaine by the teſtimony of *Liberatus* [o], that *Vigilius* had not writ this Epiſtle when *Silverius* returned out of exile from *Patara* into *Italy*; for *Vigilius* hearing of the returne of *Silverius*, and being in great feare of loſing the Popedome, hee haſtened then to *Belliſarius*, and intreated him to deliver *Silverius* into his cuſtody, otherwiſe, ſaid hee, *non poſſum facere quod à me exigis*, *I cannot doe that which you require me*. *Belliſarius* required of him two things, as the ſame *Liberat.* witneſſeth, the one to performe his promiſe to the Empreſſe, & that was [p] the overthrowing of the Councel at *Chalcedon*: the other, to pay him the two hundred pieces of Gold, which hee promiſed to himſelfe; whereby it is moſt evident, that at *Silverius* returning into *Italy*, *Vigilius* had done neither of theſe, and ſo not writ this Epiſtle. Now it is moſt likely, that *Silverius* returned into *Italy*, *an.* 540. for ſeeing he dyed [q] in the month of *Iune* that yeare, and being preſently upon [r] his returne ſent away into the Iland of *Palmaria* by *Vigilius*, a little time, you may be ſure, would ſerve to famiſh an old & diſhearthened man. But *Gretzer* eaſeth us in this point, and plainly profeſſeth [s], that this Epiſtle was writ in that ſame yeare 440. wherein *Silverius* dyed. If now you doe conſider how little time there was betwixt the death of *Silverius*, and his delivery to *Vigilius*, and how in that ſhort time

n *Bar. an 538. nu. 14, 15.*

o *Lib. loc. cit.*

p *Auguſta Vigilium profiteri flagitavit ut ſi Papa fieret tolleret Synodum, &c. Lubenter ſuſcepit Vigilius promiſſum. Liber. loc. cit.*

q *Silverius hoc anno obiit, 12. Kalend. Iulij. Ba. an. 540. nu. 2*

r *Ita Silverius traditus duobus Vigilij ſervis, qui in Palmariam abductus ſub eorum cuſtodia defecit inedia. Lib. loc. cit.*

s *Mors Silverij fuit an. 540. et hoc ipſo itidem anno Vigilius ad Theodoram ſcripſit, promiſſa exolvere volens: Gretz. def. ca. 10 lib. 4. de Pont.*

time alſo *Vigilius* had a greater worke, and of more importance to looke unto, than the writing of letters to depoſed Biſhops, to wit, to provide that *Silverius* ſhould not live, that himſelfe ſhould not bee expelled his owne See, and how upon *Silverius* death himſelfe might be againe lawfully choſen Pope; none I thinke will ſuppoſe that *Vig.* writ this before *Silverius* death in that yeare, but after it, and after all his troubles ended, when hee having quiet poſſeſſion of the See, had leiſure to thinke on ſuch matters. But why ſtay I in the proofe hereof, this being clearly teſtified by *Nauclerus*, who thus writeth [t], *Silverius being dead, Vigilius was created Pope, quod poſtquam comperit Theodora, which when Theodora underſtood, ſhe writ unto him to performe his promiſe about Anthimus, but Vigilius anſwered, farre be this from me, I ſpake unadviſedly before, and I am ſorry for it.* So *Nauclerus*; who therein no doubt followed *Anaſtaſius*, for hee [u] having ſet downe both the ſame motion made by *Theodora*, and the anſwer given by *Vigilius*, *Binius* [x] obſerves, that this was done when *Vigilius* was now the rightfull and true Pope: wherefore ſeeing *Theodora* writ to Pope *Vigilius*, and that after the death of *Silverius*, to performe his promiſe, it is certaine, that before then he had not done it, and ſo that untill hee was the onely true and lawfull Pope hee did not write this Epiſtle, which would have given full content to *Theodora*; and ſeeing againe we have clearly proved that hee did write it, it remaineth that hee writ it after the death of *Silverius*, when himſelfe was the onely lawfull and true Biſhop of *Rome*. One doubt in this matter remaineth, which *Binius* [y] ſleightly mentioneth, for that *Vigilius* after he was true Pope, did not onely anathematize *Anthimus*, and confirme his depoſition, but profeſſe himſelfe alſo to defend the Councell of *Chalcedon*, as appeares both by his Epiſtle to *Iuſtinian* and *Mennas*, dated foure months [z] after hee was the true Pope; and by that anſwer, which, as *Anaſtaſius* and *Nauclerus* ſay, hee ſent (in [a] writing) to *Theodora*, that hee would not now reſtore *Anthimus*, being an heretike: Whence it may bee collected, that after he was once the true and lawfull Pope, *nihil horum dixerit, ſcripſerit vel egerit, that hee neither ſaid, writ, nor did any ſuch thing*, as it is expreſſed in this Epiſtle, for confirming the hereſie of *Eutyches*; for how is it credible, that he ſhould write both theſe, being directly contrary the one to the other?

t *Naucl. Gener. 18.*

u *Anaſt. in vit. Vigilij.*

x *Ecce ut Vigil. ſtatim ac ſanctam ſedem aſcendit, &c. Bin. not. in vit. Vig.*

y *Bin. not. in vit. Vig. § Ex Actis*

z *Epiſt. Vigilij ad Mennam 15 Calend. Octob. data eſt. Ea extat apud Bar. an. 540. nu. 25. et eodem tempore miſſa eſt etiam illa ad Iuſtinianum, apud Bar. an. 540. nu. 15. et 22.*

a *Ad hæc reſcripſit Vigilius, Anaſt. in vit. Vig.*

32. I anſwer, that had *Vigilius* bin an honeſt man, or a man of credit, of conſtancy, and reſolution, he would never have thought or dreamed to write both thoſe. But *Vigilius* was *perpaucorum hominum*, you may goe through the whole Catalogue of the Romane Popes, (and there is the beſt choiſe of wicked men in all formes and faſhions of impiety to bee found) and not picke out ſuch a *Polipus*, a turncoate, a weathercocke, as Pope *Vigilius*: *Baronius* compares him to King *Saul*, and ſaith [b], that as ſoone as hee was made the true Pope, hee was then *Saul inter Prophetas*. It is true in many things, hee was like King *Saul*, but in that act of propheſying, wherein the Cardinal compares them, there is a marvellous diſſimilitude betwixt them; *Saul* was moved by Gods Spirit, *Vigilius* by his owne will; *Saul* was acted and driven to utter thoſe propheſies, which God put into his mouth, *Vigilius* himſelfe

b *Bar. an. 540. nu. 13.*

ſelfe did guide and move his tongue, and turned it with the rudder of his unconſtant minde, when, and whitherſoever hee would; *Saul* propheſied of neceſſity, not being able to reſiſt Gods motion, *Vigilius* in hypocriſie being deſirous to pleaſe and humour other men: in a word, *Saul* had the gift, *Vigilius* the art or jugling tricke of propheſying. When he would ſeeme to be that wch indeed and in heart he was not, a Catholike Biſhop, and gaine the favour of *Iuſtinian* a Catholike Emperor; not *Saul*, nor ſcarce *Paul* more orthodoxall than *Vigilius*; when hee would open his heart and declare what hee was *intus & in cute*; not *Eutyches* or *Neſtorius* more damnably heretical than *Vigilius*. In his Epiſtle written ſecretly to *Theodoſius*, *Anthimus*, and *Severus*, he opens to them his true intent and minde, that hee was of one faith with them, an Eutychean as they were, and ſo aſſures them that hee would doe what hee could for them, when oportunity [b] ſhould be offered. In his Epiſtles to the Emperour, Empreſſe, and *Mennas*, which were to bee publike and ſeene of all, hee makes a ſhew of love to the truth, and to the Councell of *Chalcedon*, which even then hee meant, if oportunity were once offred, to adnull & a boliſh for ever. I here remember a narration, not unworthy obſerving, which long ſince a man of great gravity and judgement in law, and now one of the chiefe Iudges in this Realme, related unto me, how one of the moſt notorious Traytors in the time of our late *Queene* of happy memory, having by ſolemne vow, by oath, by receiving the holy Sacrament, bound himſelfe to murder his Soveraigne, returned home from *Italy*, but with ſuch a ſhew of zeale towards our religion, our State, and his Soveraigne, that in open Parliament (being choſen a Burgeſſe) hee made a very ſpightfull and violent invective againſt Recuſants, and ſpecially againſt Ieſuites: His Paymaſters and friends of *Rome*, expoſtulating with him then about the matter, Oh, quoth he, it was needfull I ſhould thus doe, now all feare, nay ſuſpition of me is quite removed, I have by this my open ſpeech gained truſt and credit with the Prince, with the Councell, and the whole State, I have now made an eaſie and free acceſſe to performe that holy worke. And if God had not watched over Iſraell, and his Anoynted, many times without ſuſpition and danger he might have done, and had done it indeed. Seldome are great villanies attempted but with great hypocriſie: ſuch deepe diſſembling is no novelty at *Rome*; Pope *Vigilius* was not to be taught this leſſon; no treaſon more horrible than his was at this time; Hee undertakes [c] and bindes himſelfe by his own handwriting, by his oath alſo, (the Sacrament was not as yet growne to be an obligation of ſuch deteſtable deſignes) to overthrow and aboliſh for ever the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and with it the whole Chriſtian faith; his purpoſe and reſolution of heart hee ſignifies in his hereticall Epiſtle, which, as it ſeemes, hee writ very ſhortly after hee was the true and lawfull Pope, to *Anthimus*, *Severus*, and *Theodoſius*, and ſent it privately to *Theodora*. While hee is meditating and ſeeking how to effect this, the Emperour writes unto him, requiring him to approve that faith which *Leo*, *Caleſtine*, *Agapetus*, and others his predeceſſors had embraced; and particularly to confirme the depoſition of *Anthi-*

[b] *Scribit ut ſint omnia occulta uſq; ad tempus. Bell. lib. 4. de Pont. ca. 10.*

[c] *Vigilius facta promiſſione Romam profectus eſt. Liber. ca. 22. redarguit ipſum, hereticorum pactis conventis conſcripta, juraque defenſo. Bar. an. 540. n. 4.*

mus

mus, *Severus*, and *Theodoſius*. What ſhould *Vigilius* here doe? had he refuſed to yeeld to the Emperours juſt motion, hee had bewrayed himſelfe, and his minde, and then not onely the Emperour and Græcians, but even his owne Romane Church (then orthodoxall and Catholike) would have expelled him for an heretike, and ſo hee had deprived himſelfe of all poſſibillity ever to effect his hereticall intendment: Hee ſaw it was moſt needfull for him to put on the viſor of a Catholike profeſſion, and therefore after his ſacrifice and prayer to *Laverna*, *Pulcra Laverna da mihi fallere, da juſtum ſanctumq́ videri*; then in that counterfeit habit of holineſſe he writ thoſe open letters to *Iuſtinian*, to *Mennas*, and to *Theodora*, ſo orthodoxall and Catholike, that none by them in the world could otherwiſe judge of him, but that he was another S. *Silveſter*, S. *Caleſtine*, or S. *Leo*; When by this he had gained, firſt, the reputation of ſanctity in the Church, then the good will of the Emperour and the love of all Catholikes, when every man now held *Vigilius* his *Apoſtolicall* letters or decrees for ſo many Oracles, and himſelfe for an Apoſtle and Prophet ſent from heaven to inſtruct them, then, and not before, was it time to worke his intended feat; then, and never before, hee was to publiſh his *Apoſtolicall* decree (his minde was as yet but private) for overthrow of the Catholike faith, and the Councell of *Chalcedon*: But it ſo happened, that the hereſie of the *Eutychians* was ſo generally odious, and ſo lately condemned, that there was no likelihood for him to bring his purpoſe about by eſtabliſhing it, as at the firſt he meant, but after ſome few yeares expectance there fell out another & farre fitter oportunity, & that was the defence of the *Three Chapters*, there he had the *Africane*, the *Illirian*, the *Italian*, and, in a manner, all the Weſterne Churches to partake with him in that hereſie; that oportunity *Vigilius* gladly embraceth, nor would hee let it paſſe: Then hee labours tooth and naile, and in the end, when either then or never he muſt do the deed, by his *Apoſtolicall Conſt*. he decreeth that thoſe 3. *Chapters* ſhould by al be defēded. Certainly, had that his decree prevailed, (as his purpoſe and earneſt deſire was that it ſhould) not only *Anthimus*, *Theodoſius*, & *Severus*, being *Eutychians*, but all *Arians*, *Macedonians*, all hereſies and heretikes, had at once, like ſo many wilde Bores, ruſhed into the inheritance of Chriſt; the Catholike faith, which is the only barre and fence againſt them all, being by that *Conſtitution* of *Vigilius* utterly broken downe, and by the defending of thoſe *Three Chapters*, for ever ſubverted. This was the moſt Diabolicall plot and project of Pope *Vigilius*, to ſeeme a Catholike, and openly to profeſſe before *Iuſtinian* and others the Catholike faith, and while they are ſecure of him, cloſely in the meane ſpace to undermine and blow up at once all Catholikes, and with them the Catholike faith. So there is no repugnance, no incoherence at all in theſe, though contradictory letters of *Vigilius*, both of them, the orthodoxall to *Iuſtinian*, *Theodora*, and *Mennas*, the hereticall to *Anthimus*, *Theodoſius*, and *Severus*, both were writ by *Vigilius*, both by Pope *Vigilius*, both by *Vigilius*, when he was the onely true and lawfull Pope; but the former were writ by the perſonated and viſored, the later by the naked and unmasked Pope *Vigilius*.

33. Wee have now proved, firſt, that *Vigilius* writ this hereticall Epiſtle againſt their firſt evaſion, next that hee writ it when hee was the onely true and lawfull Pope, againſt their ſecond evaſion; there remains as yet two other Pretences of *Bellarmine*, but ſuch, as *Baronius* was aſhamed to uſe ſo poore and petty excuſes for their Pope. The third evaſion then is this, that *Vigilius* in heart embraced the true faith, and onely fained himſelfe in this Epiſtle to be a favourer of the Eutychean hereſie. *Vigilius*, ſaith the Cardinall [d], was here in a great ſtraite, for if hee openly profeſſed hereſie, hee feared the Romanes, who would never indure an heretike to ſit in *Peters* Chaire; if hee ſhould on the other ſide profeſſe himſelfe a Catholike, he feared *Theodora* the hereticall Empreſſe, that ſhe would not indure him; *Itaque rationem illam excogitavit, therfore he deviſed this policy*, (and I pray you note it well) that [e] at *Rome* (or openly) hee would play the Catholike, but (ſecretly) in his private letters to the Empreſſe, and to *Anthimus*, he would faine himſelfe an heretike. Thus *Bellarmine*, who fully expreſſeth the nature and diſpoſition of Pope *Vigilius*, as if hee had not onely felt his pulſe, but beene in his boſome: Hee was indeed another *Catiline*, *Simulare, ac diſſimulare, hee could ſemble and diſſemble*, conceale what indeed hee was, ſeeme to bee what hee was not: At *Rome*, and in ſhew of the world a Catholike; at *Conſtantinople*, and in his ſecret and cloſe actions an heretike. Thus farre the Cardinall ſaith well; but hee is extremely miſtaken in one circumſtance; in that hee ſaith, that his open or Catholike profeſſion was mentall, and *ex animo*, and his private and ſecret deteſtation of the Catholike faith, was verball and fained. It was quite contrary, his heart and Intrals were all hereticall, nothing but his face and outward ſhew was Catholike: for proofe whereof I will not urge, that the Pope in this Epiſtle accurſeth and [f] anathematizeth all who hold the Catholike faith, or who beleeve otherwiſe than *Eutyches* did, for ſo hee doth alſo in his other Epiſtle to the Emperour and *Mennas*, condemne Eutycheaniſme; and yet it is no commendation for his Holineſſe, either to curſe the Catholike faith, or to curſe that faith which in his heart hee beleeveth. But this I would have conſidered, that *Vigilius* promiſed [g] under his hand-writing, yea, hee ſwore [h] alſo that he would aboliſh the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and reſtore *Anthimus*; for performance whereof hee writ [i] that private Epiſtle, which was all that as yet hee could doe. Let *Bellarmine* now ſay, if their Popes doe uſe to promiſe, and that under their hands, yea, to ſweare alſo to doe that, which they meane not to doe. Who may bee beleeved upon their words, upon their oathes, if not the Popes Holineſſe? if hee, not onely in words and writing, but in his ſolemne oathes equivocate, whoſe oath, among all that generation, can bee thought ſimple and without fraud?

34. Againe, to what end ſhould Pope *Vigilius* diſſemble ſecretly and among his intire friends, ſuch as were *Anthimus*, *Theodoſius*, and *Severus*? where or to whom ſhould he truly open himſelfe and his inward heart, if not to ſuch? The firſt leſſon that men of *Vigilius* metall learne, is that of *Lucilius* [k], *Homini amico ac familiari non eſt mentiri*

meum;

d *Bell. lib. 4. de Pontif. ca. 10. § Sciendum.*

e *Vt Romæ Catholicum ageret, et interim per literas apud Imperatricem, hæreticum ſimularet. Bell. ibid.*

f *Qui dicit in Chriſto duas formas (i. naturas) et non confitetur unam perſonâ unam eſſentiam anathema ſit. Vigil. in Epiſt. apud Liber. loc. cit.*

g *Adimple nobis quæ pronâ voluntate promiſiſti. Anaſt. in vita Vigil.*

h *Conſcriptaque juratáque hæreticorum defenſio. Bar. an. 540. nu. 4.*

i *Vigilius implens promiſſionẽ ſuam quam Auguſtæ fecerat, talẽ ſcripſit Epiſtolam. Liber. ca. 22*

k *Ex quo citat Lactant. lib. 6. divin. Inſt. ca. 18.*

meum. The *Priſcilians*, who as S. *Auſten*[l] ſhewes, were the very teachers of lying and diſſembling, and who perſwaded their fellow heretikes unto that baſe art and trade; yet even they taught that Lucilian leſſon, (and moſt impiouſly pretended[m] to collect it out of the words of the Apoſtle) Speake the truth every man to his neighbour, for we are members one of another. To his neighbour and fellow member, ſayd they, we muſt ſpeake the truth: but to ſuch as are not joyned[n] to us in the neighbourhood or fellowſhip of the ſame Religion, and who are not of the ſame body with us, to them *loqui licet oportetq; mendacium*, to them you may lye, nay you muſt not ſpeake the truth to ſuch. *Anthimus*, *Severus*, and *Theodoſius*, they were the next neighbours to *Vigilius*, all conjoyned[o] and concorporated into *Eutycheaniſme*. Had he diſſembled with them, he had beene worſe than the *Priſcilianiſts*, nay worſe than the devils themſelves, for they though they lye to all others, yet ſpeake truth among themſelves, and to *Beelzebub*, otherwiſe his kingdome could not endure. It was *Iuſtinian* and the Catholikes, who were of a contrary religion to *Vigilius*, there was little or no neighbourhood at all betwixt them: they were not concorporall, not members of one body with him, to them not being his neighbors, *& commembres* with him by the rules of that blacke Art, he might, he ought to lye: but to *Anthimus* and *Severus*, being of one body with him, he muſt ſpeake the truth.

l *Exhortantur ſuos ad mendacium, tanquam è exemplis Prophetarum, Apoſtolorum, Angelorum, et ipſius Chriſti. Aug. lib. contr. Mend. ca. 2.*

m *Aug. ibid.*

n *Cum eis qui nobis in ſocietate veritatis proximi non ſunt, nec, ut ita dicam commembres noſtri ſunt. Ibid.*

o *Gratis, quia nos Deo noſtro conjungimur, eam fidem quam tenetis, et tenuiſſe me, & tenere ſignifico, ut et anima una ſit, et cor unum. Vig. Epiſt. ad Anth. apud Lib. loc. cit.*

35. Further yet, looke to that old Caſſian rule, *Cui bono?* where, and with whom was Pope *Vigilius* to gaine more by his cogging and counterfeiting? He had now rightfull poſſeſſion of the See of *Rome*, which was the onely marke he aymed at. What hurt could three depoſed Biſhops, or the Empreſſe her ſelfe doe now unto him, being backt by the Emperor, by all Catholikes, and which is beſt, by a good cauſe? what needed he for pleaſing them to faine himſelfe an heretike? Could they thruſt *Vigilius* from his See, who could not hold their owne? or could the Empreſſe deprive *Vigilius*, who could not reſtore *Anthimus*? There was nothing that could move *Vigilius* to faine himſelfe an heretike, or to write that hereticall Epiſtle, if he had been in heart a Catholike. But being in heart hereticall, there was many moſt urgent and neceſſary inducements, why he ſhould faine himſelfe a Catholike. Had hee ſhewed his inſide unto the Emperour, and the Church, had he opened to them the hereſie lurking in his breſt, had he made it knowne that he would aboliſh the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and the Catholike faith, hee had inſtantly incenſed all againſt him; both the Emperour and the Romanes, as *Bellarmine*[p] ſayth, yea the whole Catholike Church would have joyned in the expulſing and depoſing of ſuch a wolfe and wretched heretike out of the See. S. *Peters* Chaire had beene too hot for him. *Vigilius* wiſely conſidered that it was no leſſe art to keepe, than to get the See; he knowing that without deepe diſſimulation, and without faining himſelfe a Catholike, he could not poſſibly hold it, much leſſe could he effect that which he purpoſed, and had both promiſed and ſworne to performe, and therefore by his private letter aſſuring *Anthimus*, *Severus*, *Theodoſius*, and *Theodora*, of his hearty and ſerious intent to joyne with them, and when

p *Metuebat Romanos qui hæreticum ſedere, nunquam paſſuri videbantur. Bell. loc. cit.*

when time ſerved to worke his feat, by his other publike and orthodoxall letters to *Iuſtinian*, *Theodora* and *Mennas*, hee did but caſt a miſt before their eyes, that they ſhould not ſpy his hereſie; and under that viſor of a Catholike, he did labour to undermine the whole Catholike faith. And thus much in his private letter he ſignifieth to *Anthimus* and the reſt, warning them firſt [q] of ſecreſie, leſt if his powder-plot ſhould be diſcovered (as indeed moſt happily it was) the ſudden blow ſhould not hit the Councell of *Chalcedon*: and next, that beſides their ſecreſie they ſhould diſſemble alſo no leſſe than hee did, they ſhould ſtill ſeeme [r] to ſuſpect and bee jealous of him as of their onely enemy, that their feare might make Catholikes ſecure of him, and of that ſudden blow which in a moment by the publiſhing of his Apoſtolike Edict for the adnulling of the Councell of *Chalcedon* he meant to give.

[q] Oportet ut hæc quæ ſcribo nullus agniſcat. Epiſt. Vig. apud Lib.

[r] Sed magis ſuſpectum me ante alios, habeat ſapientia veſtra ut facilius poſſim quæ cæpi, operari et perficere. Ib.

36. But *Bellarmine* [s] for all this will prove by two reaſons that *Vigilius* was not in heart [t] an heretike, nor did *ex animo* write this Epiſtle. The former is, becauſe, *non palàm in ea condemnavit Catholicam fidem, ſed occultè; he did not openly and publikely, but onely in ſecret and cloſely condemne the Catholike faith*: for hee writes therein, *Vt ſint omnia occulta uſque ad tempus; that they ſhould keepe all private untill a fitter time.* Condemne then he did the Catholike faith, but not *ex animo*, becauſe hee did ſecretly condemne it. *Ex ſtudio occultandi*, ſaith *Gretzer* [u], *by his deſire of concealing it.* *Bellarmine* collecteth this, that *Vigilius* did not ſeriouſly and from his heart, but diſſemblingly write that impious Epiſtle. As if one may not doe the ſame thing *ex animo*, and ſeriouſly, and yet doe it ſecretly. What thinkes he of *Iudas*? his plotting to betray Chriſt was cloſe and ſecret, his owne fellow Apoſtles knew not of it, but ſayd, Maſter, is it I? his friendly converſing with Chriſt, ſitting at table, and kiſſing, was open and publike, yet his outward courteſie, even his kiſſe was diſſembled, and trecherous; his malice, treaſon, and murderous affection which were ſecret and covered under thoſe outward ſhewes of love, were true and ſerious. The Powder-plotters dealt cloſely and ſecretly, all under boord: their pretended ſubjection was open, and yet the treaſon was ſerious, their obedience but fained. *Bellarmine* was but a meere novice in the Romane Court when hee writ this, and imagined that Popes doe not ſeriouſly that which they doe ſecretly.

[s] Bell. lib. 4. de Pont. ca. 10. § Sciendum.

[t] Non fuit animo hæreticus. Ibid.

[u] Gret. loc. cit.

37. His other reaſon [x] to prove that *Vigilius* was not in heart hereticall, when he writ this Epiſtle, is, becauſe he writ it not with an hereticall minde, *ſed propter cupiditatem præſidendi*, but in an ambitious deſire of preſidency. What I pray you, Is an hereticall and ambitious minde incompatible? doth ambition exclude hereſie? or in ambition for one to teach hereſie, doth that hinder him from being in heart an heretike? Scarce was there any Hereſiarch, whom ambition hath not inflamed, and who in ambition layd not the foundation of his hereſie. *Valentinus*, ſayth *Tertullian* [y], *hoped for but miſſed a Biſhopricke, in revenge thereof he kindled his hereſie, and ſet fire in that Church, wherein himſelfe could not be governour.* When *Marcion*, (ſayth *Epiphanius* [z]) *got not the preſidency, he invented his hereſie*, and puft up with pride, ſayd,

[x] Bell. ubi ſupra.

[y] Tert. cont. Valent. ca. 4.

[z] Epiph. hær. 42.

Ego

Ego findam Eccleſiam, Ile rend aſunder your Church. When *Aerius* [b] miſſed the Biſhopricke which *Euſtathius* obtained, in his ambitious pride he deviſed his hereſie, *that a Presbyter was all one with a Biſhop.* Heare Cardinall *Bellarmines* [c] owne words: *All Arch-heretickes have one common vice, and that is pride, they ſpring up in divers places, but pride is the mother of them all.* If *Vigilius* was no heretike in heart, becauſe he was ambitious, neither was *Neſtorius*, nor *Arius*, nor *Aerius*, nor *Montanus*, nor *Valentinus*, by *Bellarmines* divinity heretikes, becauſe they were all ambitious. If they notwithſtanding their ambition were (as certainly they were) Arch-heretikes, and taught their hereſies with hereticall minds, then not onely the Cardinals reaſon is inconſequent and ridiculous, but *Vigilius* for all his ambition may not onely write that Epiſtle with an hereticall minde, but be even an Hereſiarch, or rather a Pope heretike.

b *Epiph. hær. 75.*

c *Bell. lib. de not. Eccl. ca. 13.*

38. Againe, did he not write this with an hereticall minde? why did not the Cardinall expreſſe what that hereticall minde is, which was now wanting in *Vigilius*? An hereticall minde is no other but a minde pertinaciouſly and obſtinately addicted to hereſie. It was hereſie doubtleſſe which he writ, in teaching with *Eutyches* but one nature to be in Chriſt. That he writ this obſtinately, is cleare, ſeeing he writ it againſt the knowne judgement of the holy Councell of *Chalcedon*, that is, of the Catholike Church; which none can doe but even thereby he ſhewes an obſtinate and pertinacious minde, rebellious againſt the Church. If this be not, no hereticke in the world ever had an hereticall minde. If *Arius*, *Neſtorius*, and *Eutyches*, when they writ or taught their doctrines with this minde, were hereticall and heretikes, then moſt certainly *Vigilius* who writ this Epiſtle with the like obſtinate and pertinacious minde, muſt needs bee judged to be rebellious againſt the Church, and as heretically affected in minde, as *Arius* or *Eutyches* himſelfe. Pride and inſolency is ſo farre from excluding an hereticall minde, as *Bellarmine* would here perſwade, that it is even an individuall companion, yea eſſentiall unto it. None can poſſibly have an hereticall, but *eo nomine* he hath an ambitious heart, the pride whereof cauſeth him to condemne the juſt ſentence of the Catholike Church, and prefer before it his owne fancy and opinion.

39. You ſee now how inconſequent both theſe reaſons of the Cardinals are, ſeeing *Vigilius* might bee hereticall in heart, though both his writings were ſecret, and his minde ambitious. Let us yet a little further debate this matter with the Cardinall. Say you that *Vigilius* did not write this hereticall Epiſtle *ex animo*, or from his heart? I pray you when looked your Cardinalſhip into the heart of *Vigilius*? how know you that he was not an heretike in heart, when he was ſo hereticall in profeſſion? or how know you of S. *Hildebrand*, of *Boniface* 8. or of any of all the Popes that lived ſince their times, that they were not heretikes and plaine Infidels in heart, when their words were Catholike? I would gladly for my learning be informed how *Bellarmine*, or the moſt acute *Lynceus* of them all do or can know, otherwiſe than by their outward profeſſions, what any of all the Popes beleeved and thought in their heart. What *Innocent* the third, when he decreed the

doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation: what *Leo* the tenth, when he condemned *Luther*: or what *Paul*, *Iulius*, and *Pius* the fourth, when they confirmed their *Trent* Councell? How know you that in their hearts they beleeved thoſe doctrines? or that they did not diſſemble and faine, as you ſay *Vigilius* did? What can you ſay for *Pius* the fourth, which may not be ſayd for *Vigilius* alſo? Doth *Pius* ſay, he did before, and now doth thinke as the *Trent* maſters doe? Pope *Vigilius* ſayth the like, and moſt plainly, *Eam fidem quam tenetis*, that faith which you (*Anthimus*, *Severus*, and *Theodoſius*) doe hold, I ſignifie unto you, that I have held, and that I doe now hold the ſame. Doth *Pius* call the *Trent* Fathers his beloved brethren in Chriſt? ſo doth *Vigilius* call thoſe hereticall Biſhops his beloved brethren in Chriſt: nay in *Liberatus* he calls them even Chriſts. Doth Pope *Pius* profeſſe an unity betwixt himſelfe and them, all making one body of the Church? Pope *Vigilius* doth the like, and he doth it more ſignificantly: We, ſayth he, preach this ſame doctrine that you doe, *Vt & anima una ſit & cor unum in Deo*; *ſo that there is in you and mee but one ſoule, and one heart in God.* How can any ſpeech be cordiall, if this teſtifying himſelfe to be one ſoule and one heart with them, doe not come *à fibris*, but onely *à labris*? Doth Pope *Pius* approve the doctrine of the *Trent* conſpirators? So doth Pope *Vigilius* the doctrine of thoſe *Eutychean* heretikes? Doth *Pius* condemne and anathematize *Lutherans*, *Calviniſts*, and all who thinke or teach otherwiſe than himſelfe and his *Trent* Conventicle taught or beleeved? ſo doth Pope *Vigilius* condemne and anathematize all who deny two natures in Chriſt, all who beleeve otherwiſe than himſelfe and his *Eutychean* fellow heretikes did. In all theſe there is as much to be ſayd for Pope *Vigilius*, as for Pope *Pius*: and if you pleaſe to adde that one other agreement alſo, as of *Vigilius* it is ſayd, that they knew *crudelitatem fidei*; ſo may it in like manner bee truly ſayd of Pope *Pius*, that this did manifeſt unto all men, *crudelitatem fidei, the cruelty of his and his Trent Councels faith.* If by theſe outward acts the Cardinall can know *Pius* the fourth to have *ex animo* condemned their *Trent* hereſies, why can he not by the like outward acts know *Vigilius* to have *ex animo* condemned the Catholike faith? If *Vigilius* for all theſe outward acts, and ſo many teſtimonies and evidences of a willing minde did diſſemble, and thinke in his heart otherwiſe than he writ, how will or can the Cardinall prove unto us that *Pius* the 4. and the whole Councell of *Trent* did not diſſemble, and both write and ſpeake otherwiſe than they thought in heart? Hath the Cardinall ſome windowes to pry into the ſecrets of the heart of *Pius* the fourth and the *Trent* Councell, which are dammed up that he cannot ſee into the breſt of *Vigilius*? If Pope *Pius* upon his word and writing be to be credited, much more is Pope *Vigilius*, ſeeing he did not only by words and writing teach this hereticall doctrine, but (which *Pius* did not) he bound himſelfe by a ſacred oath that hee would teach the ſame. And which is yet a farre greater evidence, *Vigilius* after this did teach the like hereticall doctrine, to overthrow the ſame Conncell of *Chalcedon*, in the cauſe of the *Three Chapters*, which hee did ſo unfainedly and ſo cordially, that for teaching the ſame he incurred the juſt indignation

nation of the Emperour, the curse of the holy generall Councell, the publike hatred of all Catholikes, and, if wee may beleeve *Baronius*, even exile and persecution also. Why might not the same *Vigilius* from his heart teach *Eutycheanisme*, as well as *Nestorianisme*? The faces of those two heresies looke contrary wayes indeed, but their tayles, like *Sampsons* Foxes, are joyned together to undermine the Catholike faith, and the holy Councell of *Chalcedon*: Hee who once is proved to be treacherous in this sort, and to doe this once from his heart, *semper præsumitur*, is alwayes to bee presumed treacherous in the same kinde: Hee who did this in the *Three Chapters*, would have done it in *Eutycheanisme*, his heart, his desire, his purpose at both times was the same, the odds was accidental in the oportunity which served better in the one, than in the other; what need they excuse his teaching *Eutycheanisme* to have been only labiall, when it is cleare his teaching of *Nestorianisme* was cordiall? If they cannot excuse Pope *Vigilius* for teaching *Nestorianisme* from his heart, which cannot possibly be done, what need they be so nice in denying his teaching of *Eutycheanisme* to have come from the same heart? his fault in them both being alike, one answer will alike serve for them both.

44. But what, thinke you, meant the Cardinall so to busie himselfe, and bee so curious about the heart and secret minde of *Vigilius*? what though hee did not in heart, yet, *exteriori professione*, by his hereticall writing, by his outward confession, by that *Vigilius* condemned the Catholike faith, as the Cardinall [d] acknowledgeth, & it is the Popes outward profession, not his inward cogitation, by which wee prove his Chayre to bee *fallible*; what have wee, nay what hath the Cardinall or any of them all to doe with *Vigilius* intent or inward thoughts? leave those to his Tribunall, who onely [e] knoweth and seeth the hearts of all the sonnes of men; let men, who cannot see the heart, looke to his words, to his writings, to that profession, by which hee teacheth others. If that be hereticall, what boots it them though his heart bee orthodoxall? *Confirma fratres, & pasce oves*, are outward acts, they looke abroad and outwardly, not to the inward and hidden man in the Popes breast. If he think as *Simon Peter*, and teach as *Simō Magus*, as *Arius*, *Nestorius*, or *Eutyches* did, is he not an hereticall teacher, an hereticall Pope, a confirmer of his brethrē in heresie, a feeder, nay, a very prisoner of the sheepe, with worse weeds than the Socraticall Cicuta? If the Pope onely thinke and beleeve heresie, why, thought is free, (to wit, from mans eye, much more from his censure) his thought is for himselfe, that errour is personall, it hurts none but the Pope himselfe. If either by word or writing hee teach heresie, that is Pontificall, it is the fault of his office, of his Chayre, which should have beene infallible, this hurts his sheepe and his brethren: Nor skilleth it at all in what manner, whether by word or writing, by what occasion or motive hee teacheth heresie, but whether at all, or upon any occasion hee wittingly and willingly teach it, that is the onely point which is questioned. *Vigilius* condemned the Catholike faith, saith Cardinall *Bellarmine* [f], but hee did it for ambition, and desire of presidency. Bee it so: If the Pope for ambition

[d] *Dico Vigilium scripsisse illam Epistolam, et damnasse Catholicam fidem, saltem exteriori professione.* Bell. lib. 4. de Pont. ca. 10. §. *Respondeo, multi.*

[e] Reg. 8. 39.

[f] Bell. loco cit.

may condemne the Catholike faith, why may hee not doe so, for feare of exile, of disgrace, of losing the Emperours, or the King of *Spaine*, or the French Kings favour? If for feare, why not for favour to purchase the good will of those, or any of them? If for favour, why not for hatred, hatred of *Henrie* the fourth, the Emperour, of *Henry* the eighth, for pulling away the best feather out of the Popes Plume, of *Luther* for being so busie in medling with his Indulgences, and the triple Crowne? If for hatred or favour, why not for desire of lucre, and to keepe the gaine of their crafts-men and Image workers, who continually sing that note in the Popes eare, Great is *Diana* of the Ephesians, great is the Church and S. *Peters* Chayre? Why not for any like passion of the minde may the Pope condemne the Catholike faith? On what a tickliſh and slippery ground doth their whole faith stand, when either the Popes ambition, or feare, or favour, or love, or hatred, or anger, or desire, or a fit of any other perturbation, which disturbeth his minde, may procure, as at this time it did in *Vigilius*, an anathema to the Catholike faith? Best it were for them to renew the Stoicall sect and doctrine, and receive it in the Church, that out of those sober and unmoved mindes, as out of an happy Nursery of Popes, the Cardinals might in the Conclave still elect a Pope voyde of all passions and perturbations, and transplant him out of the Stoicall to their *Apostolicall Chaire*. But sure, so long as they goe no further than the Conclave, they shall never finde any but of the same metall with *Vigilius*, one that may bee tossed every way with ambition, with envy, with love, with hatred, with feare, and every passion of his minde, as a powder-plot to blow up the whole Catholike faith; and when he hath done that by his words, by his writing, by his preaching and teaching, by any of his outward acts whatsoever, Cardinall *Bellarmine* can excuse it, and wipe away all the disgrace of it, as here hee doth in *Vigilius*; hee did it not with an hereticall minde, for hee did it for ambition, hee did it for feare, hee did it for hatred; hee did it for some other passion, hee did it onely by an exteriour act, and not *ex animo*: But in the meane time whether hee did it *ex animo*, or otherwise by his exteriour act, the Catholike faith is blowne up from the foundation thereof, as much by the Popes act, as by the act of *Arius*, of *Nestorius*, of *Eutyches*, or any other heretike; and the Church hath a goodly amends indeed, that the Pope forsooth did not (which is impossible for him or all heretikes in the world to doe) blow it up with an imagination or inward thought, but with an exteriour act of his teaching by word or writing.

[f] Bell. loc. cit.

41. Oh but, sayth *Bellarmine* [f], *non damnavit fidem palam, sed occultè, Vigilius did not openly but closely condemne the Catholike faith*: Closely, so he did indeed; it was his purpose and intent so to doe. He came not now as *Nero*, or *Diocletian*, with open force to batter, but as *Simon Magus*, *Arius*, *Nestorius*, *Eutyches*, and other heretikes, with *Synomian* arts, to undermine the Church; all his worke was under the vault. The Anathema denounced in this Epistle against all who hold two natures in Christ, was the powder that should have blowne up the holy Synod, and Senate, the House of God, and whole City of God:

The

the powder, the person and all was ready, onely, which the Cardinall observes [g], the time for the open publishing of that Anathema, and setting fire to the traine was not yet come. The gracious Providence of God, which watcheth over Israell, the admirable zeale, piety, prudence, and *vigilancy*, which God put into the heart of *Iustinian*, the constancy of faith in the Greeke Church, which at that time most happily fell out to bee greater than at any time before or since, by these was the fatall blow intended by *Vigilius*, most happily prevented. This close and secret working proves Pope *Vigilius* to have beene both subtill and malicious in condemning the faith; it doth excuse him neither *à toto*, nor *tanto*, from his condemning the faith or from being an hereticall Pope, labouring by his hereticall doctrine to subvert the faith.

[g] *Vt sint omnia occulta, usque ad tempus. Bell. loc. cit.*

42. The fourth and last Evasion or excuse for *Vigilius* fact in writing this Epistle, is *Bellarmines* also; *Vigilius*, saith hee [h], did not at that time define any thing against the faith, *tanquam Pontifex*, as hee was Pope. What shuffling and shifting is this in the Cardinall? hee did not define any thing against the faith, as Pope: Hee did then define that which was against the faith, but hee defined it not as Pope, for otherwise it had beene foolish to say, he defined it not as Pope, when hee defined it, neither as Pope, nor as no Pope, when hee defined it not at all. Againe, what a worthy saying is this of a Cardinall? *Vigilius* did not at that time define it as hee was Pope; at that time, to wit, while *Silverius* lived and was the onely Pope, at which time, as himselfe in expresse words saith, *Vigilius Papa non erat*, *Vigilius was not then the Pope*. What needed the Cardinall say hee defined it not at that time as hee was Pope, when at that time he was not Pope? This reduplication, *quatenus Papa*, implies hee was Pope, and that being Pope hee defined it, but hee defined it not as hee was Pope, but as hee was a private man, or some other way: Would not the Cardinall laugh, if *Gretzer* or any such good friend of his should say, *Bellarmine* at that time while hee was at *Ingolstad* writ not his Controversies as he was Pope, or, hee writ them not as he was a Turke, a Iew, or Mahumetane? But leaving these shifts, which demonstrate plainly, that *Bellarmine* had a desire to say somewhat in excuse of *Vigilius*, but knew not what, and therefore snatched at this or that, or any thing, though it were never so crosse unto himselfe, and such also as he could not hold. Let us consider the Exception it selfe; *Vigilius* writ this Epistle, that is confessed; hee writ it when hee was the onely true and lawfull Pope, that wee have proved; hee defined heresie in it, and that which is against the faith, that *Bellarmine* implyeth; hee condemned in it the Catholike faith, that *Bellarmine* in plaine words expresseth. Thus far the cause is cleare. Now whether Pope *Vigilius* in it defined heresie, and condemned the Catholike faith, as he was Pope, or no, that is the point here to be debated.

[h] *Bell. 4. de Pōt. ca. 10. § Sciendū*

43. Some may thinke, that *Bellarmine* by those two reasons drawne from secresie and an ambitious minde, by which he laboured before, to prove, that *Vigilius* did not condemne the faith *ex animo*, meant also that he condemned it not as Pope, for it followeth in the

next ſentence, *ſiquidem Epiſtolam ſcripſit*, as giving a reaſon of his ſaying. If any like to take *Bellar.* words in that ſort, then his reaſons are before hand refuted, for as *Vigilius* might, *ex animo*, write heretically, both privately and out of ambition, ſo alſo might hee, *tanquam Pontifex*, condemne the faith, notwithſtanding both his ſecrecy and ambitious mind; ſecrecy and an ambitious mind are no more repugnant to the one, than to the other, they are compatible with them both; the Pope may uſe his *Apoſtolicall* authority in teaching, as wel privately as publikely, as well with *Iudas* in ambition, as with *Iohn* or *Peter* in ſincerity of heart. But the Cardinals Apologiſt, who it may be conſulted with the Cardinall about his intent herein, doth eaſe us of
[1] Gretz. loc. cit. thoſe reaſons, for hee [1] tels us plainly, that from *Vigilius* his deſire of ſecrecie, *nil aliud colligit*, *Bellarmine collects or proves nothing elſe*, but this, that *Vigilius* did not write his letter from his heart or *ſeriò*, that hee did it not in earneſt. It is but a ſport with *Gretzer*, or with the Pope, to condemne the Catholike faith; they doe it, but they doe it not in earneſt, they doe it *jocularitèr* not *ſeriò*. Have ye indeed ſuch May-games & ſports at *Rome*, as to condemne the faith, and then ſay, I was in jeſt, and in ſport? Are not theſe men new Philiſtines, Call in *Sampſon*, Condemne the Catholike faith, to make us paſtime? But let us leave them to their ſports, till the fall of their Babyloniſh houſe make a cataſtrophe and doleſull end both of their actors & ſpectators: That which I now note, is, that *Bellarmine* doth not in thoſe words, *Siquidem Epiſtolam ſcripſit, &c.* from the privateneſſe or ſecrecy prove any thing elſe, but that *Vigilius* writ it not *ſeriò*, in earneſt and from his heart; that hee writ it not, *tanquam Pontifex*, this thoſe words prove not, *Bellarmine* in thoſe words collects not: So we have now nothing but the bare ſaying of *Bellarmine*, without any proofe, without any reaſons, and I muſt needs confeſſe, I hold it a moſt ſufficient encounter for any man to *Bellarmines ipſe dixit*, to oppoſe, *ipſe dico*, yet becauſe I deſire rather to ſatisfie ſuch as ſeeke the truth, then contend with thoſe who ſeeke to ſmother and betray the truth, I will a little further enlarge this point, and ſee if it may be cleared by evidence of reaſon, that Pope *Vigilius* did not onely condemne the Catholike faith at that time, but that he did it even as hee was Pope, and, *tanquam Pontifex*, condemne the Catholike faith.

44. What it is for a Pope to teach an errour as Pope, may be perceived by other Arts and Sciences, in the practice or exerciſe whereof, together with knowledge, judgement, and skill, fidelity alſo is required; were *Baronius* or ſome Romane *Facundus* to examine this point, they would quickly ſute the Pope to ſome Cobler, Pedler, or ſuch like companion: I love not to deale ſo rudely with his Holineſſe, yet if I ſhould happen at any time to let ſlip a word that way, you know how the Cardinall quitted the religious Emperour with, *Ne ultra crepidam*. If a Phyſitian, or Lawyer, or Iudge in any diſcourſe ſhould ſpeake barbarouſly or incongruouſly, they erre therein but as Grammarians, not as Iudges, Lawyers or Phyſitians; But if a Iudge for any ſiniſter reſpect ſhould pronounce that ſentence as juſt, which is againſt the law; or if a Lawyer ſhould after his diligent ſifting of the

the cause, affirme that title to bee found, which were clearely voide in law; or if a Physitian should prescribe to his patient Coloquintida for an wholesome diet, each of them now erred & offended in his owne profession, & in that proper duty w^ch belonged to them; the Iudge as a Iudge, the Counsellor as a Counsellor, the Physitian as a Physitian, because they failed either in skill or in fidelity in those faculties wherein they professe both to know themselves, and to make knowne unto others what is right and good: If in other matters they transgresse, it is not, *quatenus tales*; if any of them bee prophane, covetous, or intemperate, they offend now, *quatenus homines*, as they are mortall men in those duties of morality, which are common to them with all men: If they bee seditious, rebellious, and conspire in treasonable practice, they offend, *quatenus Cives*, as they are parts of the Common-wealth, in those duties which are common to them with all subjects; but when they offend in Physick, law, or judgment, those are their own peculiar Arts and Sciences, they then offend, neither *quatenus homines*, nor *quatenus Cives*, nor in any other respect, but *quatenus tales*, as they are such professors: for now they transgresse against those proper duties, which, as they are Iudges, Counsellors, or Physitians, are required of them. The like of all Artificers, of Grāmarians, Logicians, Poets, Philosophers, of Presbyters, of Bishops, of the Professors of Theology, which is *scientia scientiarum*, is to bee said. If a Divine shall speake rudely, incongruously, *ad populum Antiochenum*, he offends as a Grammarian, not as a Divine, unlesse perhaps it bee no fault when it doth so happen for edification, that hee ought so to speake, as Saint *Austen*[k] did use divers barbarismes, and say, *ossum* for *os*, *floriet* for *florebit*, *dolus* for *dolor*; *Malo me populus*, I had rather edifie with rudenesse of words than speake nothing but pure Ciceronian without edifying them, without honouring God; But if a Bishop or any Divine, in stead of truth teach heresie, either because hee knowes not the truth, or knowing it, oppugnes the truth, hee is now in his owne element, he offends no longer as a Rhetorician, or Grammarian, but, *quatenus talis*, as hee is a Bishop, as hee is a Divine, as hee is one who both should know, and bring others to the knowledge of the truth. And this, beside that by reason it is evident, is grounded on that saying of *Austen*[l], *Aliter servit Rex qua homo, aliter qua Rex*, for as a King serveth God, *qua Rex*, in doing that which none but a King can doe; so a King, or a Bishop, or any other offendeth God, as a King, or Bishop, in doing against that duty which none but they are to doe.

k Aust. lib. 4. de doct. Christ. ca. 16. et Tract. 7. in Joan.

l Aug. Epist. 50.

45. Now, what is said of all Sciences, Arts and mysteries, that is in due proportion to be applyed to that greatest mysterie of mysteries, and Craft above all Crafts, to their Pope-craft, or mysterie of Iniquity: He is the sheepheard to feed all, the Physitian to cure all, the Counsellor to advise all, the Iudge to decide al, the Monarke to command all, hee is all in all, nay, above all; hard it is to define him or his duties, hee is indefinite, infinite, transcendent above all limits, above all definitions, above all rule, yea, above all reason also: But as the Nymphs not able to measure the vastnes of the Gyants whole body, measured onely the compasse of his thumbe with a thred, and by it

knew

knew and admired the bigneſſe of his Gyganteon body; ſo let us conſider but the thumbe, or little toe of his Holineſſe fault, and by it conjecture the immenſity of this eldeſt ſonne of *Anak*. *Paſce oves & confirma fratres*, muſt bee to us as the Nymphes thred or line, for theſe two are the Popes peculiars, in which are contained all the reſt, and they reach as farre as heaven and hell, they are the Popes duty, *quatenus* hee is Pope. If at any time, or upon any occaſion hee ſwarve from this line, if by his doctrine he caſt downe his brethren, inſtead of confirming them, or give them poyſon in ſtead of good food, he offends not now as Swines-ſnout [m], nor as *Peter* [n] of *Tarantaſia*, nor as *Hugh Bone companion*, but *quatenus Papa*, even as Pope; in that very Paſtorall and Papall duty, which properly and peculiarly belongeth to him as Pope. Lay now this line and thred to Pope *Vigilius*, and his Epiſtle; did he confirme *Anthimus*, *Theodoſius*, and *Severus* in the faith, when he told them, that, by Gods [o] helpe both before and then alſo he held the ſame faith with them, and that was Eutycheaniſme, and that they were joyned to him in the charity which is in Chriſt? or was this wholſome food, which hee, the great Paſtor of their ſoules, ſet before them: Accurſed be all that deny one and affirme two natures to have beene in Chriſt? If this bee hereticall doctrine, ſeeing Pope *Vigilius* fed them, and confirmed them in this faith, then certainely he taught hereſie as Pope; that is, hee exerciſed his Papall office, even that of feeding and confirming his brethren, which is peculiar to the Pope, as Pope, to the teaching and approving of hereſie at this time.

m *Sunt qui Sergium 2. prius dicant os porci vocatum, et ob turpitudinem cognomenti, Sergy nomen ſumpſiſſe, eamq; conſuetudinem ad poſteros manaſſe, &c. Plat. in vita Serg. 2.*

n *Dicimus quidem quod Innocentius hoc dixit, non ut Papa, ſed ut Petrus de Tarantaſia. In Extrav. Joban. 22. Tit. 14. de verbor. ſignif. ca. 5. Greg. 13. antea Hugo dictus à Boncompagnorũ familia oriundus. Anto. Cicar. in eius vita.*

o *Vigil. in epiſt. apud Liber. loc. cit.*

46. If yet wee ſhall goe ſomewhat more preciſely and exactly to worke, according to line and meaſure; thoſe acts of feeding and confirming doe but in a very equivocall ſenſe (for their doctrine is full of Equivocation) agree to other Biſhops, but ſtill a maine difference or odds is to bee obſerved, betwixt the Popes feeding and confirming, as hee is Pope, and all others; when any other Biſhop teacheth hereſie, becauſe his teaching is ſubordinate and fallible, one may, nay, he muſt doubt or feare to feed on ſuch food, he muſt ſtill receive it with this caution or *tacit* appeale of his heart, if his holineſſe commend it for an wholeſome diet of the ſoule. But if the Pope teach any hereſie; if hee ſay that the Sunne is darke; the left, the write hand; poyſon an wholeſome food; Eutycheaniſme or Neſtorianiſme, the orthodoxall faith; here, becauſe there is no higher judge to whom you may appeale, you are bound upon ſalvation, without any doubt or ſcruple at all, to eate and devoure this meate; you may not judge, nay, you may not diſpute or aske any man whether it be true or no, the Popes teaching is ſupreme, and therefore infallible, indubitable; this is to teach, to feed, to confirme as Pope, for none can thus teach or feed, but onely the Pope as Pope. So the ſame hereticall doctrine, when it is taught by the Pope, as he is a private man, is a private inſtruction without any publike authority to teach; when by him, as a Preſbiter, it is an inſtruction with publike authority to teach, but without judicatory power to cenſure the gainſayers; when by him, as a Biſhop, it is both with pulike authority and judicatory power to cenſure, ſuſpend, or excommunicate the gainſayers, but yet ſubordinate and fallible, including

ding a virtuall appeale to the higheſt tribunall of the Pope, when by him, as Pope, it hath all the former conditions, both publike authority to teach, and judiciall power to cenſure, and, which is the Popes peculiar prerogative, as Pope, to doe thoſe with *infallibility* of judgement, and *ſupremacy* of authority, ſuch as none may refuſe, or doubt to beleeve and embraee.

47. If any will here reply with the Sophiſter *Thraſimachus* his ſubtilty in *Plato* [p], that the Pope, as Pope, teacheth not amiſſe, but as hee faileth in the Popes duty, as hee wants skill or will to performe that office: This muſt bee acknowledged as true indeed, for in the ſtricteſt ſenſe of all, what the Pope is as Pope, that muſt inſeparably agree to every Pope, and the manner of his teaching as Pope, muſt inſeparably agree to the teaching of every Pope, even as Logicians [q] ſay, that what agreeth to a man, a bird, or a tree, *quatenus talia*, as they are ſuch, muſt agree to every man, bird and tree. But this quirke and ſubtilty will not helpe their cauſe, nor excuſe the Pope from erring as Pope; for as in this ſenſe no Pope, as Pope, doth erre, becauſe then every Pope ſhould erre in all doctrines which hee teacheth, ſo neither in the ſame ſenſe doth any Pope, as Pope, teach the truth, for then every doctrine of every Pope ſhould bee true. Againe, as according to this ſenſe, no Pope as Pope, ſo no Biſhop as Biſhop, no Preſbyter as Preſbyter doth erre or teach hereſie, for did hee in his teaching erre as Biſhop or Preſbyter, then every Preſbyter and every Biſhop, and ſo even the Apoſtles themſelves ſhould erre in their teaching. But as *Vigilius* or *Liberius* when they taught *Arianiſme*, *Eutycheaniſme*, or *Neſtorianiſme*, did this not ſimply as Popes, but as perſons not knowing as in duty they ſhould, what to teach; or knowing it, but willingly teaching the contrary to their knowledge, which in duty they ſhould not: even ſo *Neſtorius*, *Macedonius*, *Arius*, and *Eutyches*, every Biſhop, and Preſbyter, when they erred, they erred not ſimply as Biſhops, or as Preſbyters, but as perſons failing in their Epiſcopall, or Preſbyteriall duties, either not knowing the truth, as by their office they ſhould, or wilfully oppugning and contradicting the truth, as by their office they ſhould not: So by his ſubtilty, if any applaud themſelves in it, not only the Biſhops of *Rome*, but of *Conſtantinople*, of *Antioch*, of *Alexandria*, yea, all Biſhops and Preſbyters in the world ſhall be as free from errour, as his holineſſe himſelfe, yea, all profeſſors of any Art, Science, or faculty, ſhall plead the like Papall exemption from errour; every man ſhall bee a Pope in his owne faculty; no Grammarian ſpeaking incongruouſly as a Grammarian, but as wanting the skil required in a Grammarian; no Iudge giving a wrongfull ſentence as a Iudge, no Galeniſt miniſtring unwholſome phyſicke as a Phyſitian, no Artificer working any thing amiſſe in his trade, as an Artificer, but as being defective in the duties either of that knowledge, or of that fidelity which is required in a Iudge, a Phyſitian, and in every Artificer. If they will exempt all Biſhops and Preſbyters, all Iudges and Phyſitians from erring, as they are ſuch Officers or Artificers, we alſo will in the ſame ſort and ſenſe allow the like immunity to the Pope: If they notwithſtanding this ſubtilty, will admit another Biſhop

[p] *Plat. lib. 1. de Repub.*

[q] *Per hanc conditionem quatenus ipſam, notatur quod prædicatum ineſt ſubjecto ſecundum propriam ſubjecti naturam. Iac. Zab. com. in ca. 4. lib. demon. text. 36.*

ſhop to erre as Biſhop, they muſt not thinke much if wee exempt not the Pope as Pope: For, to ſpeake that which is the very truth of them all, and exactly to meaſure every thing by his owne line, a Iudge ſimply as Iudge doth pronounce a judiciall ſentence, as a skilfull and faithfull judge, an upright judiciall ſentence; as an unskilful or unfaithfull Iudge, an erronious or unjuſt ſentence. A Biſhop or Preſbyter ſimply as Biſhop or Preſbyter, doth teach with publike authority in the Church; as a skilfull and faithfull Biſhop or Preſbyter he teacheth the truth of God; as an ignorant and unfaithful Biſhop he teacheth errours and hereſies in the Church, the one without, the other with judicall power to cenſure the gainſayers. The like in all Arts, Sciences, and faculties is to be ſayd, even in the Pope himſelfe. A Pope ſimply as he is Pope and defined by them, teacheth both with authority to teach, with power to cenſure the gainſayers, and with a ſupremacy of judgement binding all to embrace his doctrine without appeale, without doubt, as an *infallible* Oracle: as a skilfull or faithfull Pope he teacheth the truth in that ſort, as an unskilfull or unfaithfull Pope he teacheth errour or hereſie with the like authority, power, and ſupremacy, binding others to receive and ſwallow up his hereſies for Catholike truth, and that with a moſt blind obedience, without once doubting of the ſame.

48. Apply this to *Vigilius* & his hereticall Epiſtle: In a vulgar ſenſe; *Vig.* erred as Pope, becauſe he erred in thoſe very Pōtifical duties of feeding & confirming, wch are proper to his office. In a ſtrickt ſenſe; though hee did not therein erre ſimply as Pope, but *quatenus talis*, taught onely with a ſupreme binding authority, yet hee erred as an unfaithfull Pope, binding others by that his Pontificall and ſupreme authority to receive *Eutycheaniſme* as Catholike truth, without once moving any doubt or making ſcruple of the ſame. What may wee thinke will they oppoſe to this; If they ſay *Vigilius* doth not expreſſe in this Epiſtle, that hee writ it by his *Apoſtolicall* authority. Hee doth not indeed. Now doth Pope *Leo* in that Epiſtle to *Flavianus*, againſt the hereſie of *Eutyches*, which to have beene writ by his *Apoſtolicall* authorty, and as hee was Pope none of them doe or will deny, that Epiſtle being approved by the whole Councell [1] of *Chalcedon*. Pope *Leo* by his Papall authority condemneth *Eutycheaniſme*, Pope *Vigilius* by his Papall authority confirme *Eutycheaniſme*: both of them confirmed their doctrine by their Papall authority; both writ as Popes, the one as *orthodoxall*, the other as a perfidious and *hereticall* Pope; neither of both expreſſe that their *Apoſtolicall* authority by which they both writ. The like in many other Epiſtles of *Leo*, and of other Popes might eaſily bee obſerved. Not the tenth part of their decretal Epiſtles, ſuch as they writ as Popes, have this clauſe of doing it by their *Apoſtolicall* authority expreſſed in them. It is ſufficient that this is vertually in them all, and vertually it is in this of Pope *Vigilius*: Yea, but hee taught this onely in a private letter to a few, to *Anthimus*, *Severus* and *Theodoſius*, not in a publike, generall, and encyclicall Epiſtles, written for inſtruction of the whole Church. What, is the Pope fallible in teaching of a few, in confirming three of his brethren? why

[1] *Conc. Chalc. Act. 2. ci 3.*

why not in foure, in eight, in twenty? and if in twenty, why not in an hundred? if ſo, why not in a thouſand? if in one, why not in two, foure, or ten thouſand? *Caudæq; pilos ut equinæ paulatim vellam*; where, or at what number ſhall we ſtay, as being the leaſt which with infallibility he can teach? Certainly, *confirma fratres, & in cathedra ſede, & paſce oves*, reſpects two as well as two millions. If in confirming or feeding three, the Chaire may bee erroneous, how can wee know to what number God hath tyed the infallibility of it? But the ſixt generall Councell may teach them a better leſſon. Pope *Honorius* writ an hereticall Epiſtle [r] but onely to *Sergius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, *Vigilius* writ this to three, all of patriarchall dignity as *Sergius* was. *Honorius* writ it privately, as *Vigilius* did, which was the cauſe, as it ſeemes, that the Romane Church tooke ſo little notice thereof: yet though it was private, and but to one, it is condemned by the ſixt Councell, for [t] a domaticall writing of Pope *Honorius*, for a writing wherein hee confirmes others in hereſie: and Pope *Leo* [u] the ſecond judged it to bee ſuch as was a blemiſh to the *Apoſtolike* See, ſuch as by which *Honorius* did labour to ſubvert the Catholike faith. The like and more danger was in this, to theſe three depoſed patriarchs. It confirmed them in hereſie; it confirmed the Empreſſe; it confirmed all that tooke part with them; it was the meanes whereby the faith was in hazard to have beene utterly ſubverted. For plurality or paucity it is not materiall, be they few, be they moe: if the Pope as Pope, or as an hereticall pope may confirme three, or but one, that one is abundant to prove his Chaire and judiciall ſentence not to be *infallible*.

[r] *Quæ recitatur Conc. 6. Act. 12. pa. 64.*

[t] *Vocantur iſtæ et aliæ Epiſtolæ, dogmatica ſcripta. In eodem Conc. Act. 12. p. 65. a. et retractantes dogmaticas Epiſtolas, à Sergio, et ab Honorio ad Sergium. Act. 13. pa. 67. a. et, Honorius impia dogmata confirmavit. Ibid.*

[u] *Anathematizamus quoque Honorium, qui hanc Apoſtolicam Eccleſiam, et immaculatam fidem prophana proditione ſubvertere conatus eſt. Leo 2. Epiſt. 1*

49. But he taught this alone, not in a Councell, not with advice of his Cardinalls, and Conſiſtory: why, he did it not as a member of a Councell, but as [x] *Princeps Eccleſiæ*. He did this as did *Agapetus* [y] in depoſing *Anthimius*, above and beſides the Canons. The whole power of his *Apoſtolike* authority much ſhined in this deciſion, more than in any other, where either his Cardinals or a Councell hath ought to doe: much more was this done by him as Pope, than any of them. And yet had he liſted to follow the judgement of others, or of a Synod herein, what better direction, advice, or counſell, could his Cardinalls, or any Synod in the world give unto him, than the decree of the whole Councell of *Chalcedon*? That *Vigilius* had before his eyes at this time, that was in ſtead of a thouſand Cardinals unto him, ſeeing he as *Eccleſiæ Princeps*, defined *Eutycheaniſme*, notwithſtanding that moſt holy and generall Synod, yea againſt that Synod, what could the advice of another, or of a few Cardinals have avayled at this time?

[x] *Pontifex non ut præſes Concilij, ſed ut Princeps Eccleſiæ ſummus poteſt iudicium Concilij retractare, &c. Bell. lib. 2. de Conc. ca. 18. § Dico ſecundo.*

[y] *Agapeti Papæ contra Anthimi iudicium abſq; Synodo fuit, ſecundum ſuprèmam Apoſtolicæ ſedis authoritatem, quæ ſupra omnes Canones Pontifex eminet. Bar. an. 536. nu. 23.*

50. Thus all the evaſions which they uſe, being refuted, it may now be clearly concluded, not onely that *Vigilius* writ this impious and hereticall Epiſtle, and writ it when he was the true and lawfull Pope; but that he writ it alſo *ex animo*, even out of an hereticall heart, and writ it as he was Pope, that is, in ſuch ſort as that by his Pontificall and ſupreme authority hee confirmed that hereſie which hee taught therein. And this is the former of his Acts, which as I told you is very remarkable, his purpoſe and intent therein being the overthrow of the Councell at *Chalcedon*, and of the whole Catholike faith.

51. The

51. The other act of *Vigilius* concernes the cauſe of the *three Chapters*, wherein by the hereſie of *Neſtorius*, he publikely decreed and performed that (as much as in him lay, and as by his *Apoſtolicall* decree could be effected,) which hee had purpoſed and intended to doe by the hereſie of *Eutycheaniſme*. In which whole cauſe, how *Vigilius* from the firſt to the laſt, behaved himſelfe, how at the firſt hee oppugned the Emperours moſt religious Edict, and the Catholike faith, how afterward he played the diſſembling *Proteus* with the Emperour and the whole Church, for the ſpace of five or ſix yeares together, how at the laſt he returned to his naturall and habituall love of hereſie, and how in decreeing it by the fulneſſe of his *Apoſtolicall* authority, hee ſought utterly and for ever to aboliſh the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and with it the whole Catholike faith; the former Treatiſe doth abundantly declare; which withall demonſtrates the vanity of that ſaying of *Bellarmine*: [*For the time*, ſayth he [a], *that hee was true Pope, neither any errour, nor ſimulation of errour was found in him: ſed ſumma conſtantia in fide, but the greateſt conſtancy of faith that could be.* For as by our former treatiſe is evident, he was not only moſt wavering, but hereticall in faith. And this was in a manner the whole courſe of *Vigilius* life, or the moſt eminent acts thereof while he was Pope; pretending orthodoxy, but embracing hereſie, and as opportunity offered it ſelfe, labouring by words, by private Epiſtles, by reſiſting the imperiall, juſt, and godly Edict, by publike conſtitutions to overthrow the faith and the whole Church of God.

a Bell. lib. 4. de Pont. ca. 10. § Contigit. Ab hoc tempore nullus inventus eſt in Vigilio, aut error, aut erroris ſimulatio, &c.

52. You ſee now his ingreſſe into the Papacy, and his progreſſe in the ſame: touching his egreſſe both out of it and this life, heare what S. *Liberatus* [b] ſaith: *How Vigilius being by hereſie afflicted, died, it is knowne unto all.* Heare what Cardinall *Bellarmine* [c] ſaith out of *Liberatus*, *Ab illa ipſa hæreſi afflictus, Vigilius was miſerably afflicted by that ſelfe ſame hereſie*, which at the firſt he nouriſhed: and againe, *Miſere vexatus uſque ad mortem*, he was miſerably vexed even untill hee dyed. Heare *Baronius*, who firſt promiſed [d] to declare how *invigilavit in Vigilio vindicta Dei; how the vengeance of God watched Vigilius*, and at laſt revenged the innocent blood which he ſhed: and then performing that promiſe, ſayth [e], *He died in an Iland in Sicily by the juſt judgement of God; confectus ipſe ærumnis ex morbo, himſelfe being waſted with miſery, by reaſon of his diſeaſe, who had cauſed Silverius in an Iland in Palmaria to bee pined away, and put to death.* As he got the papacy by wicked meanes, ſo was he *immenſis agitatus fluctibus, toſſed with exceeding great tempeſts therein, hated by the Emperour, not gratefull to the Eaſterne, and execrable to the Weſterne Biſhops: and when hee ſeemed to have come out of the ſtreame into the haven, and almoſt one foot into the City, being pined away, immenſis doloribus, with unmeaſurable paines, he dyed.* Thus *Baronius*. Now if we ſhould deale with him as *Baronius* [f] doth with *Iuſtinian*, and by his precedent acts judge of his reward, according to the Text, *Opera eorum ſequuntur eos*, I feare the cenſure would ſeeme very harſh to thoſe who are ſo ready to examine *Iuſtinian* by that rule. For what workes I pray you followed Pope *Vigilius*? Ambition, uſurpation, ſacriledge, murder, ſymony, hypocriſie, ſchiſme, hereſie, and Anti-chriſtianiſme,

b Liber. Brev. a. 22.
c Bell. loc. cit.
d Bar. an. 538. nu. 20.
e Bar. an. 556. nu. 1.
f Opinari ſi cui licet, facilius eſt invenire, qui Evagrij de ejus condemnatione (ad ſupplicia apud inferos luenda) velit ſequi ſententiam, quam uliorum. Bar. an. 565. nu. 2. & 6.

chriſtianiſme, concerning which the Apoſtle ſayth, *They which doe them ſhall not inherit the kingdome of God.* I will not, I liſt not be rigorous in this point, neither towards him or any other. I contein my ſelfe with that leſſon of the Apoſtle g, *Domino ſuo ſtat aut cadit.* Yet thus much by occaſion of this Treatiſe, and the approved judgement of the Church declared therein concerning *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia* long before dead, muſt needs bee ſaid of him, of *Baronius*, and of all other who have already, or ſhall at any time hereafter write as they have done, in defence of hereſie, and oppugnation of Gods truth; As repentance for ſuch ſinnes and impious writings opens unto them, ſo impenitency and perſevering therein, eternally ſhuts againſt them the gates of Gods mercy, and the kingdome of heaven. Both w^ch^ becauſe they are hid from mans eyes, the Church leaving the judgement of certainty and verity onely to God, paſſeth her ſentence which is the judgement of charity, by the outward and apparant acts which are open unto them: whomſoever ſhee ſeeth not, nor findes by certaine and evident proofe to have manifeſted the deteſtation and revocation of their hereticall and impious writings, which before they publiſhed and maintained, all thoſe though dead ten, an hundred, or a thouſand years before, ſhe by her cenſure doth, and doth moſt juſtly condemne, accurſe, and anathematize, as by her ſentence againſt *Theodorus* of Mopſveſtia, dead an hundred yeares before, is moſt evident, whoſe condemnation and anathema pronounced by the fift Councell, is approved by all ſucceeding generall Councels, by all Catholikes, and even by the whole Catholike Church. Nor will I here diſpute whether ſuch a ſentence doth not ſometimes paſſe, *errante clave*, the party having repented, whom they not having proofe of his repentance, thought to dye impenitent; but howſoever that fall out, none may juſtly complaine of the Churches judgement as unjuſt or unequall herein; for beſides that it is preſumed, that thoſe who ſo notoriouſly and publikely by their hereticall writings doe ſcandalize the Church and people of God, if they had ſeriouſly repented would have expreſſed ſome publike and outward teſtimony of the ſame; the Church would by this ſeverity of her cenſure, teach all men a leſſon which is very hard to learne; firſt, that they ſhould not have ſuch an itch and ambitious deſire to write or utter thoſe deteſtable hereſies which lurk within their breaſts; or if they cannot obſerve that, yet at leaſt to learne to be ſo lowly and humble in heart, as to revoke their impieties and blaſphemies, although to ſome blemiſh and diſgrace of themſelves, yet to the great honour of Gods truth, and the ſatisfaction and edification of the holy Church, which they had ſcandalized. If in ambition they will firſt oppugne the truth, and then in a worſe pride of heart, not be reclamed to the truth, nor ſhew their love unto it, why ſhould not the Church by her moſt charitable judgement ſhew her open deteſtation of their perſons, who in the inſolency of their hearts will not ſhew any open deteſtation of their hereſies? That *Vigilius* writ a papall Conſtitution in defence of hereſie, it is apparent and undenyable: that he at any time revoked that writing, I wiſh it were, but it is not yet evident. The like may be ſayd of *Baronius*, of *Pighius*, of

g Rom. 14. 4.

Eccius, of the *Laterane*, *Florentine*, and *Trent* conſpirators, of all who have whet their tongues againſt other truth, and ſpecially to uphold that fundamentall hereſie of the Popes *infallibility*. Their writings for hereſie are evident, that they ever reclamed thoſe writings, it is inevident: and if ever they and their cauſe come to bee tryed, in ſuch a free, lawfull, and oecumenicall Councell as was this fift under *Iuſtinian*, they may juſtly feare, and certainly expect from the Church, (unleſſe the diſclaming of their writings may by certaine proofe be made knowne) the very like ſentence, though a hundred yeares after theirs, as paſſed upon *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia* an hundred yeares after his death. And becauſe the houre-glaſſe for repentance is runne out to the former, all that we can doe, is (which I ſeriouſly now doe from my heart) to cry amaine unto others, to admoniſh, exhort, yea even pray and entreat them by the mercies of God, and by the love of their owne ſoules, firſt that they keepe their tongues and pennes from once uttering any hereſie; or (if they have not done that) with the ſame hands to give the medicine, wherewith they gave the wound, and as openly, nay much more openly to diſclame than they have ever proclamed their impious and hereticall doctrines.

53. You have now ſome view both of the life and death of *Vigilius*. The exact pourtraiture of the Popes lives, *Baronius* had beene able to ſet forth if he had liſted; but he addeth ſuch *fucos*, and ſo many ſophiſticall colours, that indeed ſcarce you ſhall ſee any one of them in his Annals ſet out in his native and naturall habit. If ought be amiſſe in this our deſcription, and not ſet forth according to the lively lineaments of *Vigilius* and his impieties, the equall reader will not too rigorouſly cenſure the ſame. I acknowledge that I can but *dolare* in this kinde; to poliſh and ſet forth the lively image of their Popes, I have not learned: That is an Art which may not bee too vulgar, leſt their Romane policies be too farre divulged. But by this it is eaſie to perceive what a ſilly excuſe it is which *Baronius* uſeth in this cauſe, blaming *Vigilius* for coming to *Conſtantinople*, as if not the Popes owne hereticall minde, but the ayre of *Conſtantinople* had wrought ſuch effects, as to produce that hereticall, and yet as they count it, *Apoſtolicall Conſtitution* in defence of the *Three Chapters*.

FINIS.

Laus Deo ſine fine.

Errata hæc corrigat benevolus Lector.

In Textu.

Pag.48.lin.2.read *Theodorus.* ibid.lin.9.*diptiſis.* p.509.l.14.*eos.* p.99.l.3.*John* B. p.125.l.38.Catholikes. p.141 l.35.*Binius*, he was. p.145.l.39.Son of God. p.163.*prope finem*, ſubſtances. p.164.l.5.explanation. p.172.l.20.of the Pope. p.182.l.45.their preſent. p.199.*prope finem*, *Catholica.* p.216.l.17. it. p.224.l.15.Popes. p.227.l.5.yeeld. p.289.l.33.the. p.350.l.30.*æquiparare.* p.425.l.8.where is. ibid.l.27.Commans. ibid.*Marcellinus.* l.42. inflamed. p.442.*in fine*, *Euphemia.* p.462.l.11. quarrels with Pope. p.465.l.35.all this time. p.478.l.23. it was written. p.495. l.37.poyſoner of. p.500.l.35.right hand.

In Margine.

Pa.9.lit.(c). lege, *Marſorum.* p.67.lit. (e).*Antiochenum.* p.233.lit.(f). *emiſſam.* ibid.lit.(e). *corruptè.* p.409.lit. (e). *commentitias & ſuppoſititias.* p.410.lit.(q). *Conſilij* 5. p.437.lit.(l). *Concil.*5.*Coll.*5.

AN ALPHABETICALL TABLE OF THE CHIEFE THINGS CONTAINED IN THIS TREATISE.

A.

Acts in Councels not so intire, but there may be faults from the exscriber, pag. 433. Sect. 17, 18. *Acts* of the fift Councell unjustly excepted against by *Baronius*, pa. 379. sect. 3, 4.

Agnoites and other sectaries called Acephali p. 3. sect. 6.

Agapetus lost nothing by the Emperours presence, p. 464. sect. 5.

Antichrist: the Pope first Antichrist nascent; secondly, crescent; thirdly, regnant; fourthly, in their Laterane Councell he was Antichrist triumphant, pa. 186. sect. 24.

Anthimus a Catholike in shew and outward profession, p. 157. sect. 4.

Anastasius narration not helped by *Binius*, p. 458. sect. 23.

Anastasius a fabler, p. 256. sect. 23. and pa. 447. sect. 12. &c.

The *Author* of that *Apologicall* Epistle published *Anno* 1601. a vaunting Braggadochio, p. 205. sect. 10.

To *Assent* to the Popes or to their Cathedrall definitions in a cause of faith, makes one an heretike, pa. 172. sect. 6.

Author of the Edict was *Iustinian* himselfe, p. 366. sect. 6, 7.

B.

Baronius nice in approving the Epistle of *Ibas*, and why, p. 128. sect. 22.

Baronius wittingly obstinate in maintaining the heresie of *Nestorius*, by approving the later part of that epistle, p. 129. sect. 24, 25. and p. 31. sect. 28.

Baronius sports himselfe with contradictions, p. 131. sect. 27.

Baronius revileth the cause of the Three Chapt. p. 361. sect. 1.

Baronius Annals not altogether intire, pag. 435. sect. 19.

Baronius by his own reasons proves his Annals to be untrue, p. 436. sect. 19. *in fine*, & sect. 20. &c.

Baronius holds it dangerous for *Vigilius* to leave Rome to come to Constantinople, p. 462 sect. 1, 2.

Belisarius most renowned, save in the matter of *Silverius*, p. 470. sect. 11.

Bellarmine and *Baronius* at variance about the Epistle of *Vigilius* to *Anthimus*, *Severus*, and others, p. 477. sect. 19, 20. *Baronius* first reason to disprove it, is taken from the inscription p. 477. *in fine*, & p. 478. sect. 21, 22, 23. &c. his second reason, from the subscription, pa. 482. sect. 26. his last reason is, because hee was not upbraided for it by the Emperour and others, p. 483. sect. 27.

Bellarmines τυφλεια to know when a Councell decreeth any doctrine *tanquam de fide*, pa. 40. sect. 9. &c.

Baronius vilifieth the fift generall Councell, p. 266. sect. 2.

The *Banishment* of *Vigilius* after the fift Councell a fiction, p. 250. sect. 16. and p. 253. sect. 19. When and for what *Vigilius* was banished, p. 252. sect. 18.

Baronius his three reasons for *Vigilius* his consenting to the Synod after his exile, p. 245. sect. 8. First, from the testimony of *Evagrius*, sect. ibid. the second from the fact of *Iustinian* in restoring *Vigilius*, p. 247. sect. 11. the third

of *Vigilius* consenting to the Synod, taken from the words of *Liberatus*, *He was afflicted, not crowned*: p.160.sect.30.

C.

Constitution of *Vigilius* sent unto the Synod, pag.8.sect.4. *in fine*. the summe of the *Constitution* was the defence of the Three Chapters,p.10.sect.8.&c.

The *Councell* refuteth the Popes decree and ground of it,p.14.sect.1,2.&c.

The *Councell* condemneth and accurseth the Popes decree,p.17.sect.6. and p. 22.sect.15,16

The *Councels* decree consonant to Scripture.p.26.sect.24.

The fift *Councell* approved by succeeding Councels and Popes,p. 27.sect. 26. and how long.p.29.sect.29.&c.

Councells above the Pope,p.29.sect.30,31.

The *Cause* of the Three Chapters; a cause of faith,p.37.sect.3,4. &c. professed by *Baronius*,p.42.sect.14. a tryall of mens faith,p. 362. sect.4.

The *Councell* proposeth their decree about them *tanquam de fide*,p.41.sect.13.

The *Churches* in the East divided from the West about the three Chapters,p.39. sect.7.

The fift *Councell* explaineth a former definition of faith, made no decree to condemne any new heresie,p.46.sect.20,21.

Fift *Councell* of authority without the Popes approbation,p.268.sect.5,6,&c. it was neither hereticall,nor schismaticall,p.269.sect.7.it was assembled with the Popes consent,p.272.sect. 12,13.

Corruptions crept into some synodall acts, are not just causes of rejecting others of that Councell,p.378.sect.3.

The *Councell* of Chalcedon held Christ to be *unum de sancta Trinitate*, p.382.sect.8.3.the *Councell* of Chalcedon not corrupted, pa. 384. sect.6,7.

The *Constitution* of *Vigilius* no part of the synodall acts,p.399.sect.1,2,3. not published in the Synod,p.401.sect.4.

Chrysostomes bones not translated from Commanago Constantinople,p.426.sect.3.

Councell against *Councell* at Ephesus, p. 113. sect.2.

The *Church* may binde or loose a man after death, p.53.sect.15,16.

The *Church* cannot loose those who dye impenitent, p.55.sect.20,21.

Coronati & non coronati, as two sorts, so two rewards of professors,p.263.sect.43.

A *Councell* is approved, though the Pope approve it not,p.275.sect.17,18.

Generall *Councels* have sought the Popes approbation,p.287.sect.34.

Cyrill cleares himselfe of Nestorianisme, p. 123.sect.16.

D.

WHether a *dead* man may *noviter* bee condemned, is a question of faith, p. 48.sect.3.

That a *dead* man may be condemned, is the judgement of Fathers,p.49. sect. 6. the judgement of provinciall Synods, p. 50. sect.7. the judgement of generall Councels,p.ibid.sect.7. the judgement of *Baronius*,p.51.sect.16.

Defenders of the Popes infallibility accursed by the Councell,p.24.sect.20,21,22.

Dioscorus being hereticall judged *Ibas* his profession hereticall, therefore the profession of *Ibas* must be orthodoxall.*Vigilius* his reason, p.151.sect.29.

Defenders of the three Chapters heretikes, p.171. sect. 4.

Divination or Mathematicall predictions, not allowable,p.343.sect.28.

Dominus his action not inserted at Chalcedon,p.44.sect.9.

To *dissent* from the Pope in a cause of faith makes not one an heretike,p.171.sect.5.

Many *Doctrines* of their Romish Church may be held, except that of the Popes infallibility, and yet the party that holds them no papist,p.182.sect.21. *in fine*.

E.

EPistle of *Ibas* wholly hereticall, p. 19.sect. 8,9. and p.24.sect.19.

Eunomius approved not any part of this Epistle,p.20.sect.11.

Eunomius approved the confession of *Ibas*, p.21.sect.14.

The *Epistle* of *Ibas* not approved at Chalcedon,p.107.sect.2,3,4,&c.

The *Epistle* was truly the writing of *Ibas*, p.109.sect.5,6.

At *Ephesus* a great rent and division between *Iohn* and *Cyrill*,ibid.

At *Ephesus Cyrill* was deposed by the Conventicle,ibid.sect.3.

The *Emperour* ignorant for a time of the division betweene *Iohn* and *Cyrill*,p.15.sect.4.

The *Emperour* had knowledge of the division by a letter brought into the Court by a beggar,ibid.

Euſtathius full of forgeries, p. 340. ſect. 24, 25, &c.

Eutychius not baniſhed for not conſenting to the hereſie of the Phantaſtickes, p. 341. ſect. 25.

Eutychius given to divination, hereticall, and what it was, p. 343. ſect. 28, 29. for theſe ſuppoſed to be baniſhed, ibid.

Evagrius full of fables, p. 345. ſect. 30. &c.

The *Emperours* Edict reviled by *Baronius*, p. 363. ſect. 1. it was not repugnant to the orthodoxall faith, it was no ſeminary of ſedition, ibid. ſect. 3, 4.

The *Epiſtle* of *Ibas* condemned by the Councell at Chalcedon, p. 381. ſect. 1. the Epiſtle in *Cedrenus* not *Juſtinians*, p. 398. ſect. 1.

Epiſtles writ to *Dioſcorus* and *Leo* were forged, and not *Theodorets*, p. 417. ſect. 7, 8. and p. 444. ſect. 8.

Epiſtles by their erroneous inſcription are not proved to be forged, p. 429. ſect. 9, 10. &c.

Epiphanius his writing againſt images read in the ſecond Nicene Synod, and by them rejected. p. 109. ſect. 7. the booke was the booke of *Epiphanius*, p. 112. ſect. 12.

The *explanation* meant by *Ibas* was a condemning of the twelve chapters of *Cyrill*, pa. 159. ſect. 42, 43. a condemning of the faith, p. 160. ſect. 44. the like explanation meant by *Vigilius*, p. 166. ſect. 52.

F.

Facundus ſet on by the Pope writ againſt the Emperours Edict, p. 214. ſect. 4.

Facundus and *Baronius* revile the Emperor, p. 215. ſect. 4.

Facundus an enemy to the Catholike faith, p. 371. ſect. 13.

The *Foundation* being hereticall, poyſons all which is built thereon, p. 190. ſect. 29, 30.

Faith: unto certainty of faith two things required, p. 182. ſect. 8.

G.

Gontharis not trecherouſly ſlaine by *Belliſarius*, p. 448. ſect. 15.

Gregory his words and meaning pretended by *Baſil* about the three Chapt. explained, p. 43. ſect. 16, 17. &c.

H.

Heretikes dying, dye not in the peace of the Church, pag. 59. and pag. 61. §. 6.

Hereſie with pertinacy differs much from an error, p. 61. *in fine*. Firſt, in regard of matter, p. 62. ſec. 8. ſecondly, for the manner, ibid. ſec. 9. thirdly, in regard of the perſons who erre, p. 64. ſec. 11. fourthly, in regard of the Churches judgement, ibid. ſec. 12.

Hereſie in its owne habit doth leſſe harme, p. 103. ſec. 27.

Heretikes in words orthodoxall, in ſenſe and meaning hereticall, p. 147. ſec. 20. proved in *Vitalis*, ibid.

An *hereticall* profeſſion may be in termes orthodoxall, ibid. ſec. 21.

Heretikes pretend to hold with ancient Councels, p. 201. ſec. 4, 5.

Worſt *Heretikes* are the moderne Romaniſts, p. 204. ſec. 10.

Heretikes lyars in their profeſſion, pa. 207. ſec. 15.

Heretikes profeſſion contradictory to it ſelfe p. 208. ſec. 16.

An *hereticall* profeſſion gives denomination to a man rather than an orthodoxall, pa. 208. ſec. 17, 18.

Hereſie is a tryall of mens love to God, pa. 361. ſec. 2.

I.

Ibas his epiſtle unto *Maris* an heretike of Perſia, p. 125. ſec. 19. full of Neſtorianiſme.

Ibas denyeth God to be incarnate, and *Mary* the mother of God, p. 122. ſec. 13.

Ibas profeſſeth two natures and one perſon in Chriſt, p. 139. ſec. 1. and p. 143. ſec. 9.

Ibas his conſenting to the Epheſine Counſell proves not his epiſtle Catholike, p. 154. ſec.

Ibas conſented not to *Cyrill* upon his explanation, p. 155. ſec. 35. &c. *Vigilius* his firſt reaſon: explained in five ſeverall things: firſt, the Popes Rhetorick, ſec. 35. ſecond, his Chronology of time, ſec. 36. third, his Logicke, ſec. 40. the fourth and fifth, his Ethicall and Theologicall knowledge, ſec. 41. *vide* p. 168. ſec. 55.

Ibas embraced the union in Neſtorianiſme, p. 125. ſec. 19.

Ibas profeſſed not the epiſtle to bee his, as the Acts declare, p. 386. ſec. 2.

The *Image* of Chriſt ſent to *Abgarus*, a fable, p. 346. ſec. 32.

Infallibility of the Popes judgement the foundation of a papiſts faith, p. 34. ſec. 34. and a doctrine of the Romiſh Church, p. 172. ſec. 7, 8, &c. and p. 177. ſec. 13, 14.

Infallibility of the Popes judgement in cauſes of faith defended by any, makes the defen-

der

der hereticall, p.61. sec.6. and p.63. sec.10. and to dye out of the peace of the Church, ibid.

Infallibility of the Popes judgement taught by commending the Churches judgement to be infallible, and generall Councels, pa. 173. sec.8. and by the Church they understand the Pope, sec.8,9. and p.178. sec.15.

Infallibility only peculiar to the Pope, p.174 sec.11.

Infallibility of the Popes judgement is hereticall, p.180. sec.18.

Iustinian his Edict for defence of the three Chapters, p.3. sec.7.

Iustinian the Emperour spared *Vigilius* from banishment, and why, p.257. sec.26,27.

Iustinian reviled by *Baronius*, p. 324. slandered to be illiterate, p. 315. sec.3,4. for making lawes in causes of faith, sec.5,6. for persecuting *Vigilius*, sec.7.

Iustinian in his last age no Aphthardokite, p.330. sec.8. and p.333. sec.12. &c. no disturber of the peace of the Church, p.331. *in fine.*

Iustinian a defender of the faith, witnesse Pope *Agatho*, p.256. sec.16 witnesse the Rom. Synod, sec.17. witnesse the sixt Councell, sec. 18. witnesse Pope *Gregory*, sec.19.

Iustinian no subverter of the faith, pa. 349. sec.37,38.

Iustinian founded many stately Churches and Monasteries, p.350. sec.39.

Iustinian no subverter of the Empire, ibid. sec.40.

Iustinian severely censured by *Baronius*, p. 354. sec.45.

Ierusalem not advanced by the fift Synod to a Patriarchship, p.430. sec.1,2, &c.

Iustinian Diocletian-like caused not *Vigilius* to be beaten, p.453. sec.19.

Iustinian favoured not the heresie of *Anthimus*, p.454. sec.21.

K.

The *King* of England refused to send to their Trent Councell, p.308. sec.24.

Kings and Emperours have onely right to call Councels, p.239. sec.5.

L.

The *Lateran* Councell under *Leo* the 10. reprobated the Councell at *Constance* and *Basil* touching the authority of Gen: Councels p.33. sec.33.

The *Lateran* decree condemned by the Vniversity of Paris, p.34. sec.35.

The more *learned* the man is, the more dangerous are his heresies, p.123. sec.27.

Luther, his zeale that hee would not communicate in both kindes, if the Pope as Pope should command him, p.195. sec.33.

Liberatus an unfit witnesse in the cause of the three Chapt. p.373. sec.15,16.

Leo judged the Nicene Canons for the limits of Sees unalterable, p.405. sec.4.

Leo, his judgement erroneous for prehemiency of Bishops, p.400. sec.4,5.

Leontius no sufficient witnesse for the Epistle of *Theodoret*, p.415. sec.3.

Lawes besides those in the Theodosian Code, p.412. sec.5,6.

Lawfull Synods, and what makes them so, p.282. sec.24,25,26. *&c.*

To *Lawful* Synods, besides an Episcopall confirmation, p.281. sec.25. &c. there is required a Regall or Imperiall, p.285. sec.31,32.

Lawfull Councels require, first that the summons be generall, p.292. sec. 3. secondly, that it be lawfull; thirdly, that it be orderly, ibid. sec.4.

M.

Mennas died in the 21. yeare of *Iustinian*, and the Pope excommunicated him in the 25. p.237. sec.18.

The *Matrones* of Rome entreated *Constantius* to restore *Liberius*, 248. sec.12.

Monkes of Sythia slandred by *Baronius* for falsifying the Acts of the Councell at Chalcedon, p.383. sec.4,5.

Monothelite additions not extant in the fift Synod, p.409. sec.2,3.

Mennas his confession to *Vigilius* a forgery, p.441. sec.2.

Mennas not excommunicated by *Vigilius*, p.442. sec.45.

N.

Nepos died in an errour onely, not in any formall heresie, p.65. sec.13.

The 2. *Nicene* assembly a conspiracy, p.111. sec.11. *in fine.*

Nestorius his bookes being restrained, the bookes of *Theodorus* and *Diodorus* were in more esteeme, p.121. sec.12.

The *Nestorians* forged a false union between *Iohn* and *Cyrill*, p.123. sec.15. and p.134. se.34.

The *Nestorians* confessed two natures and one person in Christ, and how, p. 144. how Catholikes confesse it, ibid. sec.11,12,13.

Nestorius affirmeth the two natures to be two persons,

perſons, pa. 145. ſect. 16. ſo *Theodorus* the Maſter of *Neſtorius*, ſect. 17. to affirme this, is plaine Neſtorianiſme, proved by *Iuſtinian*, pa. 146. ſect. 18. by Pope *Iohn* the ſecond.

The *Neſtorians* in words orthodoxall, in ſenſe and meaning hereticall, pa. 147. ſect. 20. and p. 448. ſect. 22, 23. witneſſed by *Iuſtinian*, p. 449. ſect. 24. by the fift Councell, ſect. 25. by the epiſtle it ſelfe, ſect. 26, 27.

The *Neſtorians* by Nature underſtand Perſon, p. 162. ſect. 46, 47.

The *Neſtorians* ſlander *Cyrill* to teach two perſons, p. 163. ſect. 47.

Narſes for his piety and prudence beloved of *Iuſtinian*, p. 248. ſect. 12.

Narſes intreated not for *Vigilius*, pa. 249. ſect. 14.

Narſes overcame not *Totilas*, if *Binius* his gloſſe be true, p. 458. ſect. 23.

Narſes overcame not the Gothes by the interceſſion of *Mary*, p. 459. ſect. 24.

O.

THe *occaſion* of the fift Councell was thoſe *tria capitula*, p. 2. ſect. 3.

Origen commended for his gifts and learning, p. 103. ſect. 28.

Origen condemned by the Acts of the fift Synod, p. 392. ſect. 1, 2.

Origens cauſe not the cauſe of the firſt action in the fift Synod, p. 393. ſect. 3. nor the cauſe of the ſecond action in the Synod, ſect. 4.

The *order* of lawfull generall Councels, pa. 304. ſect. 19.

P.

Papiſts are truly ſuch as ground upon the Popes infallibility, p. 187. ſect. 26.

Pope Vigilius excommunicated in an African Synod, p. 236. ſect. 16.

The *Pope* refuſeth to come to the Synod, p. 4. ſect. 2, 3, 4. and the true reaſon why, pag. 6. ſect. 5.

The *Popes* preſence not needfull in a generall Councell, p. 273. ſect. 14, 15.

The *Pope* preſent in the fift Councell by his letters of inſtruction, p. 274. ſect. 16.

The *Popes* conſent makes not a Councell to be approved, p. 275. ſect. 27. *vid. lit. C.*

In the *Pope intenſivè* there is as much authority, as in the Pope with a generall Councell, *Bellarmines* aſſertion, p. 174. ſect. 10.

The *Pope* vertually both Church and Councell, p. 178. ſect. 15. p. 180. ſect. 17.

The name *Papiſt* not heard of till *Leo* the 10. p. 188. ſect. 25. to be a *Pope* an happy thing, for all is held for truth that they define, pag. 223. ſect. 16.

Papiſt had need of a ſtrong faith, relying on the Popes judgement, p. 224. ſect. 18.

Paulus Biſhop of Emiſa ſubſcribed to the anathematizing of *Neſtorius*, to perſwade an union betweene *Iohn* and *Cyrill*, p. 133. ſect. 31 his Sermon at *Alexandria*, containing an orthodoxall profeſſion of the faith, p. 134. ſec. 33.

Pelagius Pope after *Vigilius*, conſecrated by two Biſhops onely an a Presbyter of Oſtia, pa. 242. ſect. 4.

A *Pope* may erre perſonally, they ſay, but doctrinally he cannot, p. 244. ſect. 7.

The *Pope* no competent Iudge of Proteſtants, being an enemy unto them, pag. 315. ſect. 33.

Pope Clements epiſtle to *Iames* a forgery, pa. 422. ſect. 2.

Paul cenſured by ſome for an hot-headed perſon, 434. ſect. 18. *in fine.*

R.

THe Church of *Rome* holdeth no doctrine by certainty of faith, p. 181. *in fine.* and pa. 282. ſect. 20. and p. 189. ſect. 27, 28.

The *Romiſh* doctrines may bee held three wayes, p. 183. ſect. 21. *in fine.* Firſt, of them who hold the Scriptures for the foundation, p. 183. ſect. 22. ſuch were our forefathers. Second way, by grounding upon Scripture, but with pertinacy, p. 184. ſect. 23. A third way of holding them, is on the Popes word, p. 185. ſec. 24

They of the *Romane* Church are heretikes, p. 192. ſect. 31.

In their *Romane* Church no true holineſſe, p. 193. ſect. 32.

They of the *Romiſh* Church are ſchiſmatikes p. 196. ſect. 34.

Rome miſerably beſieged by *Totilas*, p. 456. ſect. 22.

Ruba not taken from Alexandria, pag. 407. ſect. 8.

S.

THe *Synod* reſolves to judge the controverſie about the three Chapt. the Pope being abſent, p. 7. ſect. 1.

Sergius Biſhop of Cyrus depoſed from his Biſhopricke, p. 706. ſect. 18.

Scripture being the ground of a mans faith is a comfort unto him, though in ſome things he

he erre, pa.191. sect.29. and p.194. sect.33.
Supremacy and infallibility are inseparably joyned, p.176. sect.12.
Schismatikes are not of the Church, pa. 199. sect.39.
Profession of *Scriptures* excuse not from heresie, p.226. sect. sect.13.
Suidas a fabler, 326. sect.4.
Sophia built by *Constantine*, the mirrour of ages, p.350. sect.39.
Switzers order in judgement, p.394. *in fine.*
Shamefull matters not added to the Acts of the fift Synod, p.408. sect.1.4.
Silverius died of famine in the Iland Palmaria, p.472. sect.13.
Synods: what makes them lawfull, p. 282. and what unlawfull p.306. sect.20.

T.

Theodorus not condemned in his life time, p.47. sect.2.
Theodorus died not in the peace of the Church p.59. sect.1,2.3,4. and p.66.
Theodorus condemned by *Cyrill* and *Proclus*, p.68. sec.2,3. and p.73. sec.11. &c. by the Ephesine Councell, p.69. sec.4. &c. by the Armenian Councell, p.72. sec. 10. by the Emperours Edict, sec. 13,14, &c. by the Catholike Church, p.76. sec.19.
Theodoret writ against *Cyrill* and the true faith, p.62. sec.4,5.
Theodoret very resolute for Nestorianisme, p.93. sec.6.
Theodoret his writings condemned by the Councell of Chalcedon, p.96. sec.12,13. and p.101. sec.23. and by *Cyrill*, p. 98. sec. 16,17.
Theodoret was not injured, though his writings were condemned, p.102. sec.24,26.
Theodoret a man of rare worth and learning, p.104. sec.29,30.
Taciturnity: the decree of taciturnity, and what effect it tooke, p. 225. sec.2,3,4. a meere fiction, p.228. sec.5,6, &c.
Trent Bishops were the Popes creatures, pa. 319. sec.37.
The *Trent* Councell conspired against Protestants, p.314. sec.32.
Theodora unjustly reviled by *Baronius*, pag. 355. sec.1.
Theodora favoured *Anthimus* as being orthodoxall, p.358. sec. 5.
Theodora not excommunicated by *Vigilius*, p.359. sec.6.
Theodorus Bishop of Cæsarea no heretike, p.368. sec.9,10.
Theodorus of Cæsarea no Origenist, pa.374. sec.17. he maimed not the Acts of the 5. Synod, p.697. sec.7.
Theodosius law in the Code not corrupted, p.411. sec.4.
Theodoret wrote that Epistle mentioned in the fift Synod, p.413. sec. 1. hee wrote it after the union, p.416. sec.6,7. and p.420. sec. 12.
Theodora writ not to *Vigilius* to restore *Anthimus*, p.449. sec.16,17.
Theodora sent not *Anthimus Scribe* to Rome for *Vigilius*, p.452. sec.18.
Theodoret sets forth his owne orthodoxy, p. 417. sec.7.
Theodoret condemned by the Councell at Ephesus, p.419. sec.10.
Theodoret writ an epistle to *Iohn* of Antioch, p.422. sec.1.
Theodoret rejoyceth over *Cyrill* being dead, p.427. sec.5.
A *Trechery* intended in Queene *Elizabeths* time by a deepe dissembler, p 488. *in medio.*

V.

Vigilius alledgeth counterfeit writings in stead of Fathers, p.78. sec.23,24. &c.
Vigilius denieth the knowne writings of *Theodorus*, p.82. sec.31.
Vigilius imputeth an heresie to the Councell of Ephesus, p.84 sec.34.
Vigilius untruly pretendeth the Councell of Chalcedon, p.84. sec.35,36.
Vigilius falsely pretendeth *Iustinian* for *Theodorus*, p.86. sec.38.
Vigilius durst not himselfe condemne *Theodorus*, p.88. sec.41,42.
Vigilius would not permit any other to condemne *Theodorus*, pa. 89. sec. 45. and pag. 99. sec.18.
Vigilius anathematizeth those that condemne *Theodorus*, p.90. sec.46.
Vigilius accuseth the Councell of Chalcedon as dissemblers, p.94. sec.8.
Vigilius condemneth Nestorianisme onely in shew, p.100. sec.20,21.
Vigilius and *Baronius* appeare in their lively colours for Nestorianisme, p.112. sec. 1. and p. 27. sec.2.
Union made betweene *Iohn* and *Cyrill*, p.116 sec.5. and how concluded, p.133. sec.30,31.
Vigilius from the Vnion labours to prove *Ibas* a Catholike, p.117. sec.7.
Vigilius approveth the whole epistle of *Ibas* p.118. sec.9.
Union in Nestorianisme, was that union which

which *Ibas* embraced, p. 127. sec. 14.

That *Vigilius* decreed this union in Neſtorianiſme with a ſetled affection, is probable, pa. 129 ſec. 23.

Vigilius approveth the confeſſion made by *Ibas*, p. 141. ſec. 3, 4, 5.

Vigilius his reaſons to prove *Ibas* profeſſion to be Catholike, p. 151. ſec. 29, &c.

Vigilius with *Ibas* approveth two perſons in Chriſt, p. 164. ſec. 48, 49, &c.

Vigilius his pretence to defend the Councell at Chalcedon, p. 200 ſec. 1, 2.

Vigilius hereticall, notwithſtanding his profeſſion of Councels, p. 208. ſec. 17.

Vigilius is ſaid to have approved the fift Councell, p. 213. ſec. 1.

Vigilius his cariage in this cauſe, and his 4. ſeverall judgements or changings, ibid. ſect. 2. *& inſequentibus.*

Vigilius for his decree of ſilence is to bee judged an heretike, p. 229. ſec. 6.

Vigilius after exile made no decree to approve the fift Councell, p. 241. ſec. 2, 3. the weſterne Church approved it not, §. 4. the Councell of Aquileia doubted to approve it, ſec. 5. *Vigilius* not ſo much as by a private conſent did approve it, ibid. pa. 245. ſect. 7. *in fine. &* ſect. 8.

Vigilius conſented to the Synod, but not to the ſynodall decree, p. 245. ſec. 8.

Vigilius was afflicted, and what his afflictions were, p. 264. ſec. 37, 38.

Vitiges yeelded himſelf to *Beliſarius*, p. 447. ſec. 16.

Vigilius loſt not by his going to Conſtantinople, p. 463. ſec. 3, 4, 5, &c. *&* p. 466. ſec. 6, & 7, 8.

Vigilius his entrance into the Popedome, and the manner of it, p. 468. ſec. 10.

Vigilius his promiſe to the Empreſſe to reſtore *Anthimus*, p. 469. ſec. 11.

Vigilius keepes not promiſe with the Empreſſe, ibid. ſec. 12.

Vigilius reſignes the Popedome, and is anew elected into it, p. 472. ſec. 14, 15.

Vigilius exactly deſcribed by *Baronius*, pag. 474. ſec. 16.

Vigilius writ unto *Anthimus*, and other Eutycheans, as unto Catholikes, p. 475. *in fine.*

Vigilius laboured to undermine the Councell of Chalcedon, p. 476.

Vigilius accurſed not *Dioſcorus*, but *Neſtorius*, p. 482. ſec. 26.

Vigilius writ this Epiſtle to *Anthimus*, after the death of *Silverius*, p. 486.

Vigilius in ſome things alike, in others unlike to K. *Saul*. p. 487. *in fine.* ſect. 30, 31.

Vigilius was hereticall, and a diſſembler, pa 488. ſec. 32. a diſſembler in the faith, in heart hereticall, p. 490. ſec. 33. *& inſequent.*

Vigilius as Pope defined againſt the faith, p. 497. ſec. 3, &c.

Vigilius his death, and the manner of it, pa. 504. ſect. 52, &c.

FINIS.